The Forum.

JANUARY, 1893.

THE CRISIS IN SILVER.

I PROPOSE in this article to consider some aspects of the silver question, principally the effect on commerce of the separate action of individual nations, with particular reference to the money legislation of the United States in its successive stages.

The monetary malady, always formidable in its effects on commerce, appears now to have entered an acute stage, causing great unrest in the United States, wide-spread discontent and alarm in India (and in the banks and other commercial establishments connected with India), a condition of affairs approaching ruin in some of the manufacturing districts of England, and a stagnation of business in all dealings with countries whose money is silver. Industrial enterprises with foreign capital have nearly come to an end in all such countries.

Can nothing be done to remedy the evil, to dispel the cloud which hangs over commerce, to strike off the fetters which bind the limbs of trade? Surely what has been ill done can be well undone. There are two classes of people who think that nothing ought to be done: a small but very vociferous class who think perhaps that they derive a benefit from the present unhealthy state of things; and a large and very powerful class, powerful through *vis inertiæ*, who believe that everything is for the best in this best of all possible worlds, who have no direct knowledge of the evils under which we suffer, and think commerce may safely be left to take care of itself. "Everything will settle down," they say, they are never tired of saying. It is so much easier to say so than to take the trouble to think. But there is also a

Copyright, 1892, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

large and increasing class, both here and in India and in the United States, who themselves wear the shoe and know where it pinches.

The two pleas by which the do-nothings seek to justify their inaction are:

1. "It is wrong to interfere with what has been after all a natural development. If there is sickness, leave nature to work the cure."

2. "Whatever mischief there is has come through the action of others, and it is no business of ours to interfere."

We traverse their pleas and we say: 1. The whole system of money is artificial, and nature has nothing to do with the matter. Those who say it must be left to nature are the old *laissez-faire* people, who indeed interfere at all points, even when they know it not, but deprecate all interference but their own. They imagine the sovereign as the representative of the pound sterling to be sacrosanct, a sort of "image which fell down from Jupiter," and that its weight, 123.27 grains, has its origin in natural law; not reflecting that the whole thing is merely a matter of statutory enactment, and that the law which prescribed that could prescribe also, as the law of 1666 did, that 1893.54 grains of silver should be an alternative form of the pound sterling. 2. It is not true that the mischief has come wholly through the action of other states; nor, if it were, that the state to which we belong is freed from the responsibility of defending its own citizens by the fact that it is the other states are injuring them.

It is hard to say who was the first offender and how far the circumstances of the time should condone the offence. In earlier times, during an era of ill-regulated bimetallism, when gold and silver served everywhere the purpose of money at such ratio as seemed convenient to the rulers of the several states, it could never have occurred to any one of them that it would be desirable to assimilate the ratio ordained in his state to that in force in a neighboring country; nor in the then political condition of the world would any such agreement have been possible. Every one fought for his own hand and strove (as indeed they have not yet ceased to do) to get an advantage over his neighbor. If either money metal became scarce, he sought by a new ordinance to rectify the ratio; but always in vain, because some discrepancy remained which caused the metals to change their monetary sphere of action.

England was the first to enact, in 1666, a definite law of free coinage of both metals, at a fixed ratio, 15½ to 1, and legal tender; but while the ratio in France was lower than this, being under 15 to 1, it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was inevitable (as Sir Isaac Newton showed in his report to the Treasury in 1817) that English silver of full weight should be exported, the various attempts to correct the ratio being either inexact or counteracted by changes in France. Thus it resulted that gold became the chief money in use. In 1774 a law was passed in England that silver coin was not to be legal tender above the value of £25, though uncoined silver was still legal tender to any amount. This was in consequence of the worn condition of the silver coinage, and in no way abrogated the bimetallic law. Nor did the absolute suspension of silver coinage in 1798 have in practice this effect, seeing that the suspension of cash payments had taken place the year before.

In the mean while France, under Calonne, had adopted, in 1785, the ratio of 15½ to 1, on the ground that "the *louis d'or* was worth more in other countries than its nominal value in France." This, reenacted in full detail by the Napoleonic law of 1803, would, as far as England and France were concerned, have formed in fact, though without concert, a bimetallic union; but we were entering upon a period of war, which made concert and even friendly communication impossible, and none therefore could perceive and appreciate the beneficent change which would have been brought about in removing the inducement to export one metal rather than another. It was the more deplorable that on the resumption of cash payments the wholly unnecessary step should have been taken, in the act of 1816, of adopting a single gold standard—unnecessary, because, if gold were desired, gold would become the chief money of England by the natural action of trade, unimpeded by the bimetallic law; and prejudicial, because it curtailed the liberty of commerce and broke that union which the laws of the two countries, enacted independently, had brought about.

The harm that it did was concealed for the time by the continuance of the French law; but when France in 1873 took independent action and suspended the operation of an important part of the law, the free coinage of silver, her action affected not only England and the United States, but the whole world of commerce; and the evil effects continue in increasing force to this day. I think it may be safely asserted that in every case independent monetary action on the part of a single state must have an effect, great or small according as the commerce of the state so acting is great or small, on the monetary affairs of all other civilized states. The effect has been shown in one striking example, but it can be easily seen in other examples as well. The United States also has often varied its money laws independently

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of other nations. First, as to the ratio: beginning in 1793 with 15½ to 1, which was the French proportion, it varied the ratio from time to time, always with the effect of causing now gold, now silver, to be exported according as the one or the other metal was undervalued by its monetary law. At present, the ratio being 16 to 1 (more correctly 15.988 to 1), if France should remove the suspension of silver coinage without concert with the United States, silver would inevitably flow to France and gold to America.

Secondly, as to the standard metal: From the date of the Independence of the United States the standard was bimetallic. In 1873, under various influences and, as President Grant declared, "inadvertently," it demonetized silver. In 1878 it remonetized the silver dollar and coined two million four hundred thousand dollars a year, but it did not restore the public liberty of coinage either by this law or by the law of 1890. By the law of 1878 the Treasury was obliged to buy two million dollars' worth of silver monthly, issuing certificates against the silver, which were legal tender for taxes and practically passed from hand to hand throughout the Union. By the law of 1890 the Treasury is obliged to buy four million five hundred thousand ounces monthly, paying in certificates which were full legal tender.

What has been the effect of these ordinances of 1878 and 1890? Almost every writer on this side of the Atlantic who touches the subject declaims on the imprudence and futility of such legislation—of laying up, as I read in a recent London "Times," "a vast and ever-accumulating stock which may not impossibly be thrown on the market if the hoarding process ceases to be in favor." The writer of those words has failed to bear in mind that these purchases are precisely parallel to our purchases of gold. They are indeed limited, while ours are unlimited; theirs are made at market price, and so are ours; our market price, however, being fixed (owing to our free coinage), theirs fluctuating. Their vaults are "bursting" (that is the classical phrase proper to this allegation) with silver and ours with gold. The gold circulates as money in the form of notes of five pounds and upward; the silver as money in the form of silver certificates and treasury notes of one dollar and upward. The amount of silver so held on the 31st of July in the United States Treasury was $437,864,467, the whole of which, except an ever-varying balance (on that date, $488,993) in course of delivery, was thus distributed: in the hands of the public, $429,093,124; in the Treasury as reserve, $8,-282,350; making a total of $437,375,474. The fear is, I suppose, that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this whole sum of $437,375,474 will be some day sold for what it will fetch; but there seems very little probability that anything will induce the United States to follow the example of Germany and demonetize a very large portion of the money current in the country, not only at an infinitely greater loss than that suffered by Germany, but with no sum such as that provided by the war indemnity to fill the void.

No doubt if it was expected that the United States Treasury purchases would restore the price of silver, the hope has been disappointed. But I doubt if it is to be regretted by Europe and India that with no apparent cost to the United States the price of the white metal has been prevented from falling to the depths which it would have otherwise reached. I doubt, on the other hand, whether the course adopted was a wiser one than a bold adoption of free coinage would have been. The latter course would, for a time at least, and perhaps permanently, have steadied the price in Europe at the point indicated by the American ratio, and the exports of silver would have been greater and the amount brought into the Treasury less.

The fifty million dollars in ounces brought in under the present law nearly absorb the whole production of the United States, leaving a margin for export so insufficient that the official unsold stock, which stood at about eight million ounces in June, 1890, is now only two million nineteen thousand ounces; and the "invisible" stock, that, namely, in the banks, then estimated at six million ounces, may now be one million five hundred thousand ounces. The belief that a rise of price would greatly augment production will commend itself to none who is acquainted with miners and their habits. The seeker for the precious metals takes as much as the earth will give him. So long as there is ore in sight he will bring it to grass; and even if he gets only a cent an ounce it is better than nothing. If his cost is greater than the price he gets, hope still leads him on. Nor need any one have feared a vast accession of imports of silver. Why should the Indian, whose rupee, though worth less gold than it was, buys him as much of the necessaries of life as it used to do, spend three per cent in getting it melted and turned into dollars? The fact that it could be so turned would, as the London "Times" justly said, equalize the gold price all over the world, and no one would care to send it.

Few who have studied the subject will be found to deny the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advantage of international concord in monetary law. I remember, indeed, the impressive tones of one of our statesmen deprecating in behalf of England "partnership with foreign nations" and urging that we should be "independent." But then he had not studied the subject, or he would have perceived that we are now partners, without any voice in determining the policy of the firm; and that we might as well demand to have winds of our own and tides of our own as seek to be independent of the action of other nations on that medium through which alone commerce between us all is possible.[1]

The nation that acts separately in these matters can by an arbitrary adoption of a diverse ratio cause the inconvenience of contrary currents in the movement of the metals. The rejection of its own existing money metal and the adoption of that of its neighbors will cause the adopted metal to be scarce in proportion to the increased demands on it, and will lower prices accordingly. So much the better, say those who think that by increasing the length of the yard-measure we should get more cloth for our money. But the rejection of either money metal by a group of states will do much more than disorganize price. The rejection of silver in Europe has reduced

[1] Independent of foreign nations! In 1872–73 the action of Germany put a force on France, and the action of France thrust down the price of silver, lowering the gold value of the money of our Indian Empire and raising the commodity value of the money of England and of all gold-using countries, and lowering *pro tanto* the prices of all commodities measured by gold. Scandinavia follows suit, making matters worse; Italy resumes cash payments, taking sixteen million pounds in gold and increasing the mischief; the United States passes the Bland Bill in 1878, and silver improves for a time and then resumes its downward course. The President, in 1885, recommends the repeal of the Bland Act, and his words alone suffice to put silver down a penny an ounce. In 1890 the new purchase bill passes, and silver goes up twenty per cent and again rapidly declines, being thenceforward in a state of flux—a condition exaggerated ever and anon by the introduction of new bills concerning silver in the Congress of the United States, by rumors and more than rumors of the adoption of the gold standard by Austria-Hungary. The result is that the price of silver is now about thirty-seven pence an ounce, against a minimum of sixty pence an ounce, which lasted a hundred years; that in a like state of flux, affected by every movement of silver, has been the trade of Lancashire and of all our manufacturing centres, and that in a like state of uncertainty has been the business of every merchant dealing with silver-using countries. Such "independence" is slavery, and the desire for it on the part of those who advocate it, ignorance and ineptitude. Happily this is not a battle-ground of the two great political parties in England, and the necessity for coöperation has been recognized by statesmen on both sides, notably by Mr. Gladstone's administration in 1881, and by Mr. Goschen in his speeches at Leeds and to the London Chamber of Commerce.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trade with silver-using countries to barter, by destroying that par of exchange between gold and silver which had so long prevailed to the great advantage of our common commerce.

Both in England and on the other side of the Atlantic the cry is in the same key but with variations. "Our gold will leave us," say my countrymen in England, such of them as take their inspiration from Lombard Street. "Our gold will leave us," say voices from America, not, I suppose, without some prompting from Wall Street. The Englishman has two fears, one internal and one external. 1. He is accustomed to the use of one hundred million pounds of sovereigns in pocket-money and till-money, and he fears that it will all vanish like fairy gold. 2. He is the Lombard of the ninteenth century, a universal lender; and he fears that his borrowers will pay him in an inferior money. I will deal with the allegation of inferiority presently, and I will say here only that if M. Chevalier's anticipations had been correct (which they might well have been) and his advice followed in 1857, gold, in which all such debts have been paid, would have been the depreciated metal. Such fears and such vaticinations are wholly untrustworthy. The American—I do not know precisely what it is that he dreads; probably that he will not have gold enough wherewith to pay his gold debts. I will deal with this fear later on.

The alarmists, both English and American, imagine, but surely they imagine wrongly, that they will themselves suffer, not only if gold goes, but if silver comes—if silver is restored to its ancient position as a partner with gold in the money-work of the world. What harm each alarmist apprehends as likely to happen to himself I have never been able to induce any one of them to state in plain terms, no doubt because they have never clearly formulated it in their own minds. They content themselves with lamentations over the future of their respective countries should this terrible measure ever become law. "The gold standard," says the Englishman, "has been the foundation of the prosperity, of the commercial supremacy, of England. Change our standard and we are lost!" "Abundance of gold," cries the American, "is the mainspring of our mercantile and industrial prosperity. It is that which enables us to rival and surpass the boasted commercial supremacy of Great Britain." Surely this is an excess of humility, humility which is scarcely congenial to the warm blood which runs in the veins of both nations, usually not lacking in self-appreciation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The financial prosperity and the commercial greatness both of Great Britain and the United States are built upon a wider and stronger basis than the color of the metal of which we make our money. They are built upon the energy, the enterprise, and the integrity of our fathers, and are maintained by the same qualities in our fathers' sons. They rest on our accumulated capital, on our accumulated mercantile experience, on the skill and sinews of our artisans and operatives; owing much to our excellent harbors, much to the abundant produce of the soil of our respective countries, but most certainly nothing to the color of our monetary standard nor to its exclusive singleness where, as with us, it is confined to one metal. If the United States had only silver for its money, as we have only gold, provided merely that there were an established ratio between the two metals, it is impossible that it could make one single grain of difference in the relative prosperity of the two nations.

An Englishman may venture to say, without being exposed to the charge of arrogance, that London is the financial centre of the world, from and to which the world's exchanges flow. Our bankers seem disposed to think that this is due to our having a gold standard, that there is nothing like leather, and that to our being the centre of financial and banking credit is due our uncontested commercial supremacy. Let us hear Mr. Goschen, an acknowledged master of the subject of "Foreign Exchanges." He is discussing the question why London is the great centre of the world's exchanges, and his words are remarkable, both for what they say and for what they do not say. There is not a single word about our gold standard, although in 1866, when he wrote the book from which I quote,[1] we had it all to ourselves. What he does say is this:

> "A partial cause might be found in the credit granted by London bankers, and also in the great reputation of the London houses, extending to all quarters of the world. But this can only be called a secondary reason, and appears on closer examination to be itself the result of the primary cause which makes England the great banking centre of the world. That primary cause is to be found in the stupendous and never-ceasing exports of England."

Venice and Florence and Genoa, each in its day, took the lead in banking and the trade of the world; and their standard was silver, though they failed not to use gold money also to supplement silver. Later Holland became the commercial centre of the world and Amsterdam the centre of banking and finance, but the money standard

[1] "Foreign Exchanges," p. 33.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Holland was silver. Was England last among the nations when her standard also was silver?

A little study of English history might be a not unprofitable occupation for some of our pseudo-monometallist[1] fanatics. They would find that our commercial grandeur was the cause and not the effect of our banking system, and that neither the one nor the other was produced by, nor dependent on, the color of our money metal. The character and quality of our money do indeed affect the commercial property, not of England and the United States alone, but of every civilized nation, not by reason of a happy selection of one rather than the other of the two precious metals, but by reason of the purity and honesty of our money, and because whether it be gold or silver or both united, the foreigner and the home-born alike can be sure that nothing will issue from our mints that has not the due weight and fineness. But we are asked to believe—and I have heard it adduced as a serious argument at a monetary conference—that gold is the proper money for a wealthy nation and silver for a poor one. The reasoning seems to be this: Sweets to the sweet. A wealthy man should have tools that argue wealth. A rich nation is composed of rich men (which it is not), and therefore, money being a tool, the money metal of such a nation should argue wealth, should contain great value in small compass. Now, besides the fact that rich nations probably contain more, in proportion, of poor and needy folk than poor ones do, what can it signify to any nation, poor or rich, whether its capital is measured in silver dollars or in gold sovereigns?

In great transactions no one touches either the one coin or the other. In small transactions who uses any large quantity of either? Are there not bank-notes? Is a bank-note for one hundred dollars more cumbrous than a bank-note for twenty pounds? Are there not such things as checks? Is it so very much more troublesome to write a check for one hundred thousand dollars than to write one for twenty thousand pounds? It is pretty nearly as easy for a poor man or a poor nation to pay the one as to pay the other. Gold is, except for the purpose of storage or for the uses of pocket-money, an inconvenient money metal. You cannot pay the wages of your laborers with gold, and rich nations have to pay wages at least as much as poor

[1] Surely they are pseudo-monometallists who insist on the money of the empire consisting of two metals, with no legal *nexus* between them. It is a bastard bimetallism that they worship, begotten without the solemnization of true and lawful matrimony between the metals.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ones. You cannot pay your soldiers with gold, especially if you are engaged in foreign war; and rich nations have to go to war sometimes as well as poor ones. You may hoard gold for war purposes; but as soon as war begins you must change it into silver either at home or at the capital nearest to the seat of war.[1] Some may think it easier to transport; but the freight is *ad valorem* and gold is easier to steal than silver. Neither silver nor gold is used in great transactions, except, occasionally, in war and for the purpose of redressing the balance of trade. The great mass of international indebtedness is met by the transfer of consumable commodities, and in redressing the balance between their imports and exports it is necessary that the specie be, as far as possible, unvarying in value. But especially is this quality necessary when we consider it as the measure of all other values, and this is, by the admission of all the best authorities, not obtainable in any single money metal, and least of all in gold, the production of which has been most fitful and the variations in the stock of which have been consequently greatest. The two metals bound together by the tie of a legal ratio give, as Jevons shows, the best guarantees for stability under such a system. Silver, then, is only a worse money than gold, and gold, then, only a worse money than silver, when, there being no legal uniformity of ratio established between them by international accord, artificial changes are produced in the relative value of the two metals by arbitrary legislation of particular nations.

But if it is proposed to establish such international accord an outcry is at once raised. "Our gold will leave the country," says an eminent banker, "and our debtors will pay us in an inferior metal. It will be disastrous; and it will be inoperative, for every one will contract himself out of the law." How he is able to reconcile the two statements, that the measure will be disastrous and at the same time inoperative, has not been made clear. Nor has it been shown that our debts will be paid in silver, or that there will be any inducement so to pay them, nor that it would do us any harm if they were. What constitutes inferiority in a money metal? Nothing, I apprehend, of any importance, but its possessing less purchasing power than some other. When, therefore, gold had become so scarce in France that silver money was almost the only measure of value in internal transactions, then, if that metal was inferior to gold, prices so measured must have inevitably risen. But that was notoriously not the case.

[1] The specie sent abroad for the use of the troops during the Peninsular War was: silver, £5,305,806; gold, £519,647; copper, £654.—"Bullion Report," 1810.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So its inferiority remains to be proved. The argument from bulk is surely not worth refuting before readers who are conversant with checks.

Our friends in the United States, those of them who are moved by the fears to which I have referred and are haunted by the dread of having to deal with some nineteenth-century Gehazi with his two talents of silver bound in two bags, think that a flood of silver is to pour upon them from the Western mines, perhaps also a flood from other bimetallic or silver-using countries, which will, it is imagined, use the United States as a "dumping-ground," as the phrase is, for their silver; and that silver, in virtue of some law unknown alike to Gresham and to Newton, will extrude gold out of the country, just as water, if enough were poured in, would eject oil out of a tub. Our friends in England, those, that is to say, who dwell in Lombard Street or Downing Street, the bankers who deal only in the counters (while we merchants play the game), who have no direct interest in the question, nor indeed any practical knowledge of what the words "par of exchange" mean; the statesmen who take their cue from the bankers, and who shut their eyes to the realities of the position—all incline to fear that gold, which in their vain dreams they regard as the only palladium of British commerce, will leave us; and they decline for the most part even to examine the question. They are, as Mr. Goschen said, so confident of the monometallist faith that is in them that they refuse to give, or even think out, any reasons for it. To awaken them from these dreams and help them more truly to appreciate the situation, let us examine the allegations: first, that the gold will go; and, second, that, as newspaper writers assure us, it would be a national calamity if it did go.

Under what circumstances does specie leave a country? Certainly it does not go of itself; and certainly no one sends it away because he has no use for it, or because he has too much of it, or because having enough or too much of one kind of it he wishes to get rid of the other kind. Broadly speaking, nothing will take money metal from a country but the balance of trade. If the value of the exports of purchasable commodities does not equal the value of the imports, specie, which is stored commodities, is exported to rectify the balance. The production of silver, monetized and absorbed under the provisions of the United States law of 1890, cannot, however large it may be, directly and immediately drive specie, whether it be silver or gold, out of the country. The effect of an excessive production and of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consequent enlargement of the circulation would be primarily to increase prices in the United States, and thus, unless impeded by other legislation, to stimulate imports and discourage exports. The balance of trade would go against the country and specie would have to be exported to redress it. To a silver-using country, such as India, silver might be sent. To gold-using countries, or to bimetallic countries where the law of free coinage of silver is suspended, gold must be sent; and if the balance of trade should continue adverse, whether from the cause above mentioned or from other causes, gold would continue to be sent away; and even though there is no obligation to deliver gold rather than silver, and though with each export of gold a counteracting influence would be set up, the stock would gradually diminish.

So also in England the balance of trade has to be rectified by import or export of specie; and as the law interposes no check on the free export of gold, but every one who has a credit with the Bank of England can demand and must receive gold, gold must go unless checked by other means. This is what happens under our monometallic law in this country and, indirectly, in the United States also; and bankers and those who share their fears might reasonably, under present circumstances, be expected now and then to cry out, "The gold will go," even though its going may not be so harmful as they suppose. But under an international bimetallic law, with a common ratio, would either the probability or the evil results of its going be increased? The ready and thoughtless answer comes: "To be sure it would." Does not every one by this time know the Gresham law (which is as certain as the law of gravitation), and that under it the cheaper metal drives out the dearer? Silver costs less to produce than gold: therefore it is the cheaper; and therefore it must drive out gold, which is the dearer."

Every one no doubt thinks he knows the Gresham law; but has that omniscient personage ever taken the trouble to read what Gresham wrote? Gresham said nothing about "cheaper" or "dearer," nor about "one metal driving out another." Nor, if he had used the words "cheaper" and "dearer," could he have meant "cheaper and dearer in cost of production"; because about the relative cost of the vast existing stocks of silver and gold, or about the average cost of one ounce of either, he knew absolutely nothing; and no doubt he well knew that he knew nothing. We know that some silver can be produced at one shilling and four pence an ounce; and some—by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unsuccessful miner—at five pounds, or any larger cost, per ounce; but of what was or will be the average cost at any given time of each ounce of the total stock of the silver measure of value, we know nothing at all.

What Gresham said—in effect—was that if there were two shillings in circulation, one weighing one hundred grains and the other ninety-five, both being equally legal tender, the heavy one would be exported when export was wanted, and the light one would stay; just as England was, till lately, full of light sovereigns and half-sovereigns, while heavy ones served for export. The heavy shilling and the heavy sovereign were *dearer* in France as measured in French commodities than the light ones. They would buy more of them, and were sent thither accordingly. The light sovereign and the light shilling would buy less of them, *i.e.*, were *cheaper* when measured in them, and accordingly stayed at home. The dearer metal is that which is dearer elsewhere, and the cheaper is that which is cheaper, not in its own country but in another. This is the true operation of the Gresham law; and it is consonant with Sir Isaac Newton's exposition in his report to the Treasury.[1] Thus when, in the United States, silver was valued 16 to 1 of gold, it was dearer in France, where the ratio was 15½ to 1; and it was sent thither because the sender discharged his debt of an ounce of gold with 15½ ounces of silver and kept half an ounce in his pocket, the French sender remitting gold for the like reason. Gold and silver were each the dearer (and cheaper) metal at the same moment, but in different markets. The diversity of ratio caused silver to flow to France and gold to America.

Under an international bimetallic agreement, with identity of ratio, what is to cause one metal to go rather than the other? If you say, "Gold must go," I ask, "Whither will it go?" That is a question which I have asked over and over again, but without ever receiving a satisfactory answer. One combatant in this field, having, I think, little personal experience of the present conduct and exigencies of foreign trade, tells us that it will leave all countries, so far as its money-work is concerned, and be "used for other purposes." What purposes? Ah, there the oracle is dumb. Is it to be in the arts? In what branch of art? Is it, when by the hypothesis gold is to be by far the dearest metal, that we are to invent new uses for it in common life? Or are its old uses to be multiplied? Shall gold toothpicks

[1] September, 1817.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abound? Shall the crossing-sweepers have, to every man, a gold watch, gold buttons to his coat, and a gold-headed handle to his broom —all, no doubt, provided out of the rates by the county councils of the future?

We may leave these speculations for the councils, county or otherwise, of Utopia, and come back to the questions that are of real and practical importance. Whither will the gold go under the ordinary stress of the balance of trade? Let us suppose a bimetallic union of the United States and the principal commercial nations of Europe with their dependencies. There would then be no inducement to send away gold, because there would be no nation where gold would have (at the ratio) a greater purchasing power than silver, or where (as in England at present) gold, or token representatives of gold, would have alone purchasing power. But even in England, though gold alone has purchasing power, up to 1873 no merchant cared whether he received a remittance of fifteen hundred and fifty ounces of silver or one hundred ounces of gold. The *minimum* value of the silver was necessarily the same as the gold, inasmuch as a kilogram of silver sent to Paris produced by law two hundred francs, which were at his disposal by bill of exchange. Why, then, if that law were restored, should America be under any necessity of sending gold to London rather than silver? China can now take our gold at her pleasure if she chooses to suffer the preliminary loss. Why should we continue any longer helpless, as we are now to a great extent, when the enactment of the bimetallic law would give us back the option of parting with it or keeping it as might suit ourselves? But China, some one may say, will adopt a gold currency and draw away all our gold. China may do that *now* if she is so minded; and if she sells her silver at whatever sacrifice and has credits on England, she can do so by us, for we must answer them in gold. But under a bimetallic law there would be no such compulsion.

Again, let us consider the case of an imperfect accord among the nations. Let us suppose England and Germany, or England alone, holding aloof. Then it may be thought there would be a gulf into which the gold of the bimetallic countries could be poured; and the United States, and all the others also, would be brought to be "on a silver basis." Let those who think so ask themselves what force it is that is to drive the seven hundred million pounds or so of gold money in other countries to take refuge here and remain here. What should we do with it? We have what we want for our commerce. Nothing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can come to us and stay but what the balance of trade sends and what gives directly or indirectly profit to the senders. The idea is as chimerical as that of its being used "for other purposes."

Let us suppose a third case, and one that is very germane to the bills which have lately caused so much controversy in the United States and so much perturbation in Europe. What if the United States stood alone, all other states being gold-using, as England, silver-using, as India, or under a limping standard, as France; and the United States mints were open to the unlimited coinage of both metals, at a ratio of 15½ or 16 to 1, with full legal tender? Would it be impossible that the United States should be able to do what France did for seventy years, maintain the law unimpaired? "But the system broke down," it is said, "in 1873." No, the powers of the French mint broke down under the unexampled pressure of the sudden influx of silver from Germany and the expected influx of ten times as much. So would the American mint break down if the United States were worsted in a war with China and had to pay her some one hundred million pounds indemnity in gold, and she took the opportunity of demonetizing her silver and pouring it into the American mint. We need not discuss such a *reductio ad absurdum* as that; but it would require no less a catastrophe to break down so irrefragable a system.

It will be replied, perhaps, that the case of France from 1803 to 1873 is not parallel with the present condition of the monetary world. It will be said, "What an enormous influx of silver there has been, an influx which will no doubt continue." This is a reply which can be made only by those to whom figures and facts are of no account in argument, and who are content to be certain in matters of the greatest uncertainty. During the fifty years from 1803 the production of silver was about twice that of gold, and in the next twenty years, during which the stock of gold in the world was doubled, its production was more than twice that of silver. And yet the French law of 1803 was not shaken. The so-called flood of silver is but a rivulet to the vast outpouring of gold in those two decades, and has done nothing of any account to redress the balance between the two metals. Such as it is, it has sufficed to bring down the market price of silver, because the mints have been closed. It will be time, when the mints are once opened as before, at a fixed ratio, to take into account the forty millions by which silver production has, at 15½ to 1, exceeded gold production since 1877. Calculating the relative production at a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ratio of 22, the excess would have been on the side of gold to the extent of fourteen million three hundred and thirty-nine thousand pounds.

If, then, the task were undertaken by the United States, there is an antecedent probability that the same equilibrium would be maintained by it as was maintained by France. The only reason why it should not be done is that it is not the best that can be done, seeing that an international accord would be far preferable. The United States, I think, could maintain it, either alone or in concert with one other state, with India for instance, where the present condition of things has become intolerable; but there would be one thing lacking —a perfect conviction and satisfaction in the minds of those in the United States who now oppose free coinage. An international accord would, I suppose, commend itself to them at once; whereas sole action, and possibly even an accord with one state only, would allow of doubt and distrust, which only time could dispel. There might perhaps be always in some minds a fear, however unfounded, that the United States would find itself "on a silver basis." These words seem to me to be always uttered in a tone of horror. What does the phrase mean? The only possible way in which the United States could really pass to a silver basis would be by demonetizing gold and becoming by law a silver-using country like Mexico or China; and I apprehend that it would have no temptation to do any such thing. This phrase, then, would seem to be only another form of words for the fear above discussed, that gold would leave the country. I have shown that that fear is chimerical; but if it were a thing that could possibly happen, silver would indeed become the chief money in use, but the standard would in no way be altered; the mint would still be open for the coinage of both metals into legal-tender money. That is what happened in France from 1830 to 1847, when gold was scarce, and from 1853 to 1865, when silver, owing to the great demand for India, was in like case. But the bimetallic law still existed, and in none of those years did the parity between the metals, as defined by the ratio, disappear. Every debtor, saving previous stipulation, could pay his debt in the coins of either metal; and in case of an especial demand for export of one or the other metal, would assert his right by exacting payment for foregoing it in the shape of a small *agio* on the metal in demand.

There is a mode in which a nation's money laws may be said to be on a silver basis and be yet in a different case from China; just as they may be on a gold basis and yet be in a different case from Eng-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land since 1819. That was the silver basis which Locke approved and Newton after him. Locke knew that both metals were needed for a nation's commerce; but silver had been the ancient money of England, and he did not favor any departure from it, but advocated the rating of gold to it by law at a ratio of 15½ to 1. It was bimetallism, but under the name of a silver standard.

I have now set forth, as fully as my space would permit, the fact that in respect of "current money with the merchant" all nations are bound together by their common interest; that independent action has always tended to produce dislocation of trade and commercial distress; that the time has come when our statesmen must no longer be content with empty platitudes under which they take refuge from the trouble of intelligent examination; and, finally, I have shown the futility of the fears of the only remedy for the disorder expressed by men who have no personal experience of the misfortunes suffered by too many under our present monetary laws. The question has now passed from the sphere of theory to the sphere of practice. Enough has been done, by argument, by preliminary conferences, by royal commissions; enough has been suffered by commerce all over the world, and by English manufacturers in particular. It now rests with the states that have called and assented to the international conference to bring order out of chaos, and do what alone can restore national and international prosperity.

The time has passed when statesmen could look calmly on, as they have done till within the last year or two, caring for none of these things, floating in an empyrean of their own far above us little men in whose paltry commercial concerns they took not the very faintest interest. Lancashire may lose its trade, merchants trading with South America, Mexico, India, China, Japan, may find their profit-and-loss accounts year by year more and more on the wrong side. So much the worse for Lancashire; so much the worse for the merchants. Statesmen cannot be expected to go to school again and unlearn the lessons which they learned forty years ago. Times indeed are different, circumstances have changed, events have happened which were not dreamt of forty years ago. "But what is that to us? So much the worse for the circumstances; so much the worse for the people who are affected by them."

Statesmen, if you refuse to learn new lessons from new phenomena, you will find that you will have to be taught *malgré vous*. The Secretary of State for India will no longer be able to shut his ears to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the cries which are reaching him from India itself. The Chancellor of the Exchequer will have to consider what it is that makes trade decline and continue to decline, and to remember—if he has forgotten it—that it is commerce that has made England what she is, and that all impediments to commerce are so many blows struck at the prosperity and happiness of the multitudes, high and low, rich and poor, laborers and employers of labor, producers and consumers, who make up the population of this country. The wage-earners will feel, and they will let him and his colleagues feel, that the wealth which pays their wages is diminishing, that employment is more irregular, and that the number of the unemployed is increasing; and they will ask the reason why.

What I say to England I say also to the United States. To the United States it applies also, *mutatis mutandis*. The conditions are different, the laws are in some important points different. But it, as well as we, is a nation whose very life-blood is commerce; and it and we too must sooner or later, and sooner rather than later, take the only step which can possibly restore that which is a necessity for successful and extended commerce—practical unity of the medium of exchange. In this, if in anything, there is a solidarity between nations. Their interests are in this not antagonistic, but identical; and it needs only good-will and a truly patriotic spirit to tear away the bandage of prejudice which obscures the sight of too many leading men in both countries who have hitherto failed to look, so far as this question is concerned, to the true interests of the people.

HENRY H. GIBBS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHALL THE STATE-BANK TAX BE REPEALED?

THE tax on State-bank circulation was imposed by Congress, and its repeal has been advocated solely upon the ground that it forms the one impediment to the issue by State banks and private bankers of their notes to be used as circulation. The tax was not imposed for revenue purposes, and its repeal is not advocated as a measure of tax reduction.

On the 7th of June, 1892, Mr. Richardson, a representative in Congress from Tennessee, moved to suspend the rules of the House of Representatives and pass a bill repealing the tax of ten per cent on the circulation of State banks and bankers. After the brief debate permitted by the rules of the House on such a motion the vote was taken and the proposition was defeated by a vote of eighty-four yeas and one hundred and sixteen nays. The persons voting yea were all Democrats and seventy-five of those voting nay were also Democrats.

The Chicago convention, on the 22d of June, 1892, adopted as part of its platform a plank in these words: "We recommend that the prohibitory tax of ten per cent on State-bank issues be repealed." The Republican contention during the campaign as to the meaning of this part of the Democratic platform was unquestionably accurate, both as to the motive and purposes of the men who framed this particular plank and as to the results which they sought to attain. On the one hand this plank was advocated by those who were alarmed by the agitation for the free coinage of silver as offering a substitute upon which the advocates of free silver coinage could stand, and on the other hand it was accepted by the latter class as something which could be tendered to their constituents as a partial if not a complete satisfaction of their demand for more money.

An analysis of the vote in the House of Representatives, as well as a knowledge of what took place in the room of the committee on resolutions at the Chicago convention, makes me entirely sure of the accuracy of this statement. The over-zealous advocates of free silver coinage and the over-anxious opponents of it united in the support of Mr. Richardson's resolution in the House of Representatives.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An earnest Eastern anti-free-coinage member of the committee on resolutions at Chicago pleaded with an advanced unlimited-silver-coinage man from the Southwest to accept both the silver plank and the bank-tax plank in the Chicago platform, the one as the antidote of the other.

The situation, therefore, brings the country face to face with the proposition that the issuing of the paper money, which has heretofore formed the principal medium for the transaction of business in this country, shall be controlled, not by the Federal Government and its laws, but by the legislation of the several States. That we may understand what the proposition really is, two things should be clearly noted: first, there is involved no question of the right of a State to charter a bank, but we are to determine as a matter of public policy whether banking institutions and bankers shall issue currency upon a uniform system regulated by national authority, or under at least as many systems as there are States; secondly, there is not involved as an original proposition the question of the propriety of levying such a tax, but the proposed repeal requires the consideration of the question whether the conditions are such as justify the present immediate removal of the tax.

It seems to me that no doubt can be fairly said to exist as to the right of the Federal Government to regulate the currency which, from the necessity of the situation and the intimate connection between the different parts of the country, is both intended and is certain to circulate throughout the country and be the medium of exchange in all interstate as well as internal commerce, and which, without regard to State lines, is restricted in the extent of its use only by the nature and value of the currency itself. Nor are there any facts which justify the statement that there is any imminent peril of the destruction or immediate extinguishment of the national banking system as a means of furnishing circulation. The truth is that there has been and is a steady growth in the number and distribution of national banking associations throughout the land. The fact that State banks and trust companies have been successfully established demonstrates only that the right to issue circulation is not essential to the business success and consequent existence of banking institutions.

In the last February number of the FORUM the late John J. Knox stated that "the attributes of a perfect system of paper currency in this or any other country are: 1, safety; 2, elasticity; 3, convertibility; 4, uniformity." Of course the most essential attri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bute of any such currency is its safety, and next in importance in this country is its uniformity. Without these two the elasticity of the currency would fall, as indicated by Mr. Knox, into the unfortunate *ante-bellum* condition when it was "as elastic in value as in volume." The convertibility of such currency is a necessary consequence of its absolute safety and uniformity. The national banking currency has given us an entirely safe and an entirely uniform currency, and its blessings in that respect cannot be computed or over-estimated.

We are told by some of those who advocate a return to the system of allowing State banks to issue notes that there is no danger at this time of a return to a depreciated-bank-note circulation should this restriction be removed. One writer says:

> "There is not a State in the Union which would authorize or allow it. It was the want of suitable means of communicating with every part of the country, with the object of demanding immediate redemption of the unworthy notes, which gave any facilities for what was known as 'wild-cat' bank-notes."

Had the writer who prophesies so certainly upon this subject examined some of the bills introduced into the last House of Representatives and intended to meet the supposed need for more money, or listened to the arguments in favor of the repeal of the tax on State-bank circulation, his views of what some portions of the country are likely to do if left to regulate this matter for themselves would certainly be modified. No "wild-cat" scheme of banking, no ultra-doctrine of *fiat* money could go to any greater length than did some of the measures soberly proposed and earnestly advocated by members of Congress at the last session. And it is not to be overlooked that the gentlemen making these propositions and advancing these arguments claimed to be, and doubtless were, fairly and sincerely representative of the opinions and wishes of the people in the localities from which they came. These opinions and these wishes can be expected to crystallize into laws in the communities whose representatives advocate such measures whenever such communities are left to act their pleasure unconstrained by their more conservative and experienced neighbors.

Some of the advocates of the repeal of this tax claim that the resulting State-bank circulation will be a more elastic currency, a currency which will be local and which will respond to the demands of the locality in which the bank issuing the circulation is located. Earnest and sincere questioning, however, failed to develop any reason

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for anticipating that such currency would remain local, would not flow to the money centres, and would not leave the more remote sections of the country unprovided for, precisely as it is claimed the national-bank currency now does, except that it was hoped and expected that such local currency would not be at par and of equal value away from home with the legal-tender money of the country or better-known and better-secured bank currency of the older and more wealthy States. With more or less frankness the advocates of a return to the use of such currency admitted that, unless it was depreciated, it would obey the law applicable to all money in circulation and tend to accumulate in commercial centres. The question whether a State-bank-note currency can be made as safe and of as uniform value as one regulated by national authorities so nearly answers itself against those who contend for it that about one-half the advocates of the repeal of this tax are found advocating also the regulation and supervision by Federal authority of the circulation issued by State banks.

The answer to the arguments of the rest of the advocates of this repeal can be found, first, in the history of the old State-bank circulation; and, secondly, by a consideration of the existing condition of the legislation relating to this matter in the States themselves. I have not space to recite at length the history of State-bank circulation. Some of the results of it, however, were that a bank-note detector was as necessary to a mercantile house as a ledger; that the purchase of uncurrent money, meaning the money of banks of other States, the value of which was not readily ascertainable, was as regular a business in the city of New York and elsewhere as banking itself; that the rates of exchange between the different portions of the country were enormously larger than under the present system; and that it was as necessary for a person travelling from one portion of this country to another to provide himself with money current in the locality to which he was going as it is to-day for an American going to Europe to exchange his American money for foreign money. With the enormously-increased interstate commerce and general travel, the confusion, inconvenience, and absolute loss entailed by the former system would be incalculably increased. The safety of any bank-bill not issued in his own State would always be a conundrum unsolvable to the ordinary citizen, and to the expert difficult. The uniformity of circulation, which, next to its safety, is its most important attribute, would absolutely disappear.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is written in no spirit of prophecy. An examination of the constitutions and laws of the various States as they exist to-day shows that in thirteen of them the issuing of circulation by State banks is expressly prohibited; in fifteen of them there is no provision made upon the subject; and in the rest more or less adequate provision has been made. To the inhabitants of the thirteen States the repeal of this tax would afford no relief whatever. To the inhabitants of the fifteen who have adopted no regulations whatever upon the subject of State-bank circulation, it is impossible to conjecture what the result would be. Assuming, as one eminent financier stated to me, that it is the natural right of every man to give to his neighbor his written promise to pay for the purpose of having that neighbor use it in payment, or in other words to create, if he can, a circulation upon his personal credit, it is not difficult to see that the inhabitants of the fifteen States who have no regulations upon this subject are left to the mercy of the wildest sort of "wild-cat" banking. In the remaining sixteen the regulations vary from the prudent laws of the State of New York to those which provide that banks may issue circulation without depositing security therefor to the extent of three times the amount of their paid-up capital stock. In view of this condition of legislation it would seem to be entirely plain that at the present time, at least, the safety of the community and its commercial tranquillity require that the circulation of the country shall not be left to so divergent and so confused a condition of legislation. The confusion which must follow is not a matter of prophecy, but is a matter of absolute certainty. A depreciated-bank-note circulation will be with us the day the tax is repealed. There are States which authorize and others which allow it. Chaos will take the place of order.

To those of us who have opposed the repeal of this tax and the return to State-bank circulation, there has often been quoted the assertion ascribed to Senator Sherman, that the national banking system is doomed; that it must expire with the bonds upon which it is based. The national banking system might expire with the maturity of the existing bonds, provided those bonds were not extended, as national bonds have been heretofore, or provided no others were issued, or provided no substitute for them were attainable as a basis for bank circulation. The existing United States bonds ought to be paid off on maturity, but that may not occur. Other forms of security are attainable. The greenbacks ought to be paid off and withdrawn from circulation. The whole or some part of them could be funded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a bond bearing a low rate of interest and entirely adequate as a substitute for the existing bonds as security for bank circulation. The credit of the Government in its present condition enables it to keep the greenbacks at par, and will enable it to refund them at a low rate of interest. Those of us who remember the time when it taxed the ingenuity of our ablest financiers to float the greenback at all ought to understand that the perpetuation of these Government promises to pay must some day bring us again to an emergency when the Government, really needing to use its credit, will find that it is greatly impaired, if not exhausted, by its existing unredeemed promises. If thirty years ago, without any debt at all, the Government's promise to pay was discredited, it is entirely probable that that credit must some day, and when most needed, be found exhausted, not merely discredited, by the fact of the existence unredeemed for a long period of years of these mere promises to pay. A prudent man in business borrows money when he needs it and repays it when he has the means, so that his credit may be good when he again needs to use it. The same plain rule of business prudence should be applied to Government transactions.

In a tentative way, and following the views expressed by more experienced men, I suggest that a safe uniform bank circulation can be issued, secured, first, by State, county, or municipal bonds under proper regulation, for which there are abundant precedents; secondly, by being made a first lien upon the assets of the bank issuing them, including the personal liability of stockholders; thirdly, by creating a safety fund by a small tax upon the circulation itself, which shall be the common property of all the banks, and from which the notes of any insolvent bank may be paid at once, the fund to be reimbursed from the bonds or assets of such bank as the liquidation of its affairs proceeds, less the amount contributed to the fund by the defunct bank itself. I am not prepared to accept as security for the circulating medium of the country any form of obligation the payment of which is not dependent upon the exercise of the taxing power. An objection is made to the use of State bonds for this purpose, for the reason that the States cannot be sued; but the objection applies with equal force to bonds of the National Government, and could be entirely obviated by the States providing by constitutional change or legislative enactment the method for the enforcement of such obligations. Such constitutional provision or legislation would certainly follow the enactment of a law excluding from this use the bonds of any State which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did not provide means for the enforcement of its obligations. The use of State bonds for this purpose would render them more valuable and their repudiation impossible. If there had been scattered through the States which have heretofore repudiated their obligations banks whose circulation was secured by the bonds of the State itself, repudiation would never have occurred. I refer with pleasure to the prophecy of the Hon. Orlando B. Potter with regard to national bonds made in an open letter addressed to Secretary Chase in August, 1861, when our national credit was lower than that of most States to-day:

"The fact that in this way banks and bankers could obtain a national circulation for their bills would make United States stocks eagerly sought after by them, and their price would be always maintained at or above par, though they bore only a low rate of interest. Four per cents could never fall below par after the system is fairly understood and at work."

The event has justified the sagacity of Mr. Potter in making that prediction and confirms my faith in the accuracy of the view which I have expressed as to the effect that must naturally and necessarily follow the use of State bonds as a basis of circulation. An objection is also made that the Government is now the guarantor of the national-bank circulation, and that it ought not to be made the guarantor of any circulation based upon other than its own securities. To this the plain answer is that the Government is not the guarantor of the payment of the present bank circulation, but is the mere custodian of the bonds, of which it can make no other use than to sell them and apply the proceeds to the payment of the circulating notes. Similarly, it could sell the securities which should be deposited under the system suggested for whatever they would bring, and after applying the proceeds to the payment of the notes could use either the funds in the hands of the receiver of the defaulting bank or the safety fund in its own possession for the redemption of any balance of such notes remaining unpaid. With the certainty that the Government would pay these notes and recoup itself out of these securities, the notes under the new system, as under the old, would be safe and uniform in value the country over.

There is a wide demand for the use of mortgages on real estate as a basis of security for bank circulation. The objections which are unanswerable to the loaning of its capital or deposits by a bank of discount and deposit on real-estate security do not apply to the same extent or with the same force to the use of such security as a basis of circulation. The practical difficulty of ascertaining the validity or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

value of such mortgages is very great, but possibly not insurmountable. Such securities have been used heretofore, in the State of New York, without loss to the note holders. I have, however, neither given the time nor have I the space in this article to attempt to elaborate a system for the use of such securities for this purpose which would be satisfactory even to myself.

My conclusions are that the country is not prepared and ready to-day to meet or cope with the problems which would arise from the repeal of the tax on State-bank circulation; that the return to the system of regulating the issue of such currency by State laws can never be safely or successfully made; that control over the issuing of bank circulation is a constitutional function of the Federal Government, and the exercise of such control in the present situation of the country is necessary and presents no insurmountable difficulty.

There are defects in the national-bank system which ought to be remedied. The system can, however, be perfected only by removing these defects as experience develops them. Two of them are now made apparent by the demand from a large section of the country for more circulation. The amount of circulation to be issued to a bank should be dependent upon the market, not upon the face value, of its securities. It is beyond dispute that the present bonds used as a basis of circulation justify, as the necessities of the country are claimed to require, the issuing of circulation to the banks to the full face value of the bonds deposited by them. As the banks receive their franchises from the Government for a public purpose, there is no hardship in compelling them to exercise to the fullest extent their privileges for the public good. They should be compelled by law to issue and keep in circulation their notes to the full extent to which they have the right to issue them granted as one of their privileges. The issuing of circulation should be not only a privilege but a duty.

HENRY BACON.

NOVEMBER 16, 1892.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NECESSITY FOR A NATIONAL QUARANTINE.

ALTHOUGH the Constitution of the United States authorizes the National Congress, in the same article which grants the power to protect the general public against the invasion of a foreign enemy, to guard the general welfare, seldom in the history of national legislation has this authority been exercised in providing ways and means for the defence of the nation against the enormous injuries which have been frequently caused by invasions of epidemic diseases. Neither have the legislative powers of the States ever been adequately or at all systematically put into operation in providing fully efficient local defences of this nature.

That the National Congress has authority to control quarantine the Supreme Court of the United States has virtually decided. In the case of the Morgan Steamship Company *versus* the Louisiana Board of Health (U. S. Reports, Vol. CXVIII., p. 455), Associate Justice Miller said, in delivering the opinion of the Court (May 10, 1886):

> "It may be conceded that whenever Congress shall undertake to provide for the commercial cities of the United States a general system of quarantine, or shall confide the execution of the details of such a system to a National Board of Health or to local boards, as may be found expedient, all State laws on the subject will be abrogated, or at least so far as the two are inconsistent. But until this is done the laws of the State on the subject are valid."

He further stated that "quarantine laws belong to that class of State legislation which, whether passed with intent to regulate commerce or not, must be admitted to have that effect, and which are until displaced valid or contravened by some legislation of Congress."[1]

While our statesmen and law-makers have with more or less wisdom and constancy, by the enactment of national and local laws, guarded the personal liberties and material interests of the citizen; while they have established more or less adequate regulations for internal trade and foreign commerce, and have performed the public duty of providing defences against a common enemy, they yet have

[1] Dr. Armstrong, New York "Medical Journal," September 24, 1892.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thus far, with singular neglect, failed to make any comprehensive provision against the ever-present danger to the *general welfare* from the ravages of epidemics brought to our shores from foreign lands.

I am aware that there are among distinguished sanitarians, even in this country, a few who more than question the power of any quarantine regulations that could be devised, however intelligently and thoroughly enforced, to protect efficiently the general public against foreign invasions of contagious and infectious diseases, and who are inclined to advocate the policy that the state should rather expend her energies and money in permanently removing local conditions which favor the development of epidemics and make their spread possible. But the only country where such a policy has been pursued with some measure of success is England, after fifteen or twenty years of expenditure of thirty millions of dollars a year (exclusive of and in addition to large expenditures made by the general government, for this large sum has been expended by local boards) within her compact, small terrritory, located as it is out of the main line of movement of the hordes of infecting emigrants constantly leaving all parts of Europe and outside the latitudes which favor the existence of yellow fever. After the United States of America shall have intelligently spent at least an equal sum in the persistent effort to improve the hygienic surroundings of the homes of a population already nearly twice as great as that of England, and scattered over a territory thirty-four times as extensive, we may reach a condition of public health in which it will be wise to abandon maritime quarantine and to rely mainly upon a perfect local hygiene.

Meanwhile, perceiving the enormous cost of destroying local conditions which foster epidemics by removing the filth among which they thrive, but appreciating the incalculable economic benefit which would certainly follow such a wise expenditure of hundreds of millions of the public money, I feel convinced that, in view of the danger which threatens the public health from abroad, there are only two courses between which we in this country must choose, namely: a practical abandonment of the public to a more or less individual and fruitless struggle with the agents of contagion wherever the movements of immigrants may chance to convey them; or an intelligent, constant, earnest, and vigorous effort to stop and destroy them at the ports of entry. While it is true that to remove the local conditions which favor the development and spread of diseases is to lessen greatly their harmfulness, it is none the less undeniable that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to destroy the infecting agent or to prevent its entrance into the country is by a single act to prevent the implantation of the seed and to render the harvest of death and destruction impossible, let the soil be never so fertile. Furthermore, the cost of preparing to wage a successful combat against the entrance and spread of disease among thousands of scattered villages, towns, and cities would be indefinitely greater than the cost of placing our ports in a nearly perfect state of defence against those diseases which are now subjected to quarantine. As an example of what it costs and of the time required to improve radically the hygienic condition of a single dirty city, I would point to what has recently been determined upon with regard to the city of Naples, which suffered so severely from cholera in the epidemic of 1884, namely, the demolition of seventeen thousand houses and sixty-two churches in the very heart of the city. This means the expenditure of over forty million dollars in a single sanitary work which cannot be completed in less than ten years; even then only a beginning will have been made of the radical removal of unsanitary conditions for which Naples is notorious.

The information contained in my "Report on Cholera in Europe and India" concerning the wide-spread, miserable hygienic conditions of the villages, towns, and cities of Egypt, France, Italy, Spain, and India shows conclusively the futility, at least for decades to come, of any hope of preventing the introduction, spread, and ravages among them of such a disease as cholera by purely local hygienic measures. With a faulty water supply and imperfect household and general drainage of most of our cities and towns, added to a filthy and unsanitary state of some parts of them and to a great lack of efficient local health organizations, I regret to be obliged to affirm that our own country is in almost as bad a condition. But the loss to the public occasioned by a single wide-spread epidemic of cholera, yellow fever, or small-pox is in the economic value of the lives destroyed and in the vast injuries to trade and commerce, far greater than would be the cost of the proper maintenance for many years of a perfect quarantine establishment at all of our ports. When one undertakes to estimate the loss to the country of the intrinsic value only of the lives destroyed by a wide-spread epidemic, the amount, though great, is insignificant when compared with the loss of incalculable millions of treasure due to the paralysis of industry and commerce.

The hundreds of thousands of European immigrants who annually reach our country, after starting from or passing through localities

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

infected with contagious diseases, frequently, in their persons or in their pestiferous clothing and effects, carry with them the active germs of these diseases. The herding of these immigrants into the miserably ventilated and unsanitary quarters usually provided for the steerage passengers on Atlantic steamships, the modern rapidity of ocean travel, and the great facility with which these swarms of people are soon distributed all over our country, combine to multiply the danger to the public health with which, under the incompleteness and the lax administration of our laws, this incessant influx ordinarily but now especially menaces our country.

In their enormous numbers, their poverty and their squalor, and in their frequent transport of all sorts of infections and contagions, these immigrants can be likened only to the Oriental pilgrims, in whose track pestilence has so frequently followed. It is, indeed, with the extremest rarity that small-pox or cholera has at any time been introduced into North America by travellers other than the immigrant class. To take the proper means to guard the ports of entry against the infected persons and baggage of all immigrants would probably keep cholera from our shores; to do the same with the addition of requiring compulsory vaccination—whether the person has been previously vaccinated or not—as an invariable condition precedent to the privilege of landing, would go far toward banishing small-pox from the land; and the importation of scarlet fever, diphtheria, and like diseases might likewise be prevented by adequate measures. The epidemics of yellow fever, typhus (or ship) fever, small-pox, and cholera which have raged from time to time in this country have always been imported. The past history of cholera and a study of its manner of spreading during the recent epidemic (in which its movement from east to west was unprecedentedly rapid) show that the chief, if not indeed the sole, conveyers of the infection were—as in all previous times—the persons and personal effects of immigrants, pilgrims, or large masses of soldiers.

Recognizing the enormous interest of the nation in the prevention of the incalculable injuries that follow the spread of a wide and devastating epidemic of any kind, and particularly of Asiatic cholera, I feel by many reasons impelled to advocate national supremacy in the control of quarantine as the only reliable means at the present time of safeguarding the general welfare. During the existence of cholera in Europe the transatlantic steamship companies, by carrying immigrants, not only expose the general welfare to great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

danger, but they also make it necessary to place great burdens upon maritime commerce. It was almost exclusively the immigration traffic which last summer, as in the past, caused the serious danger and damage we experienced from cholera.

It is a fact beyond dispute that cholera preys upon and breeds among those living in squalor and filth and closely follows their movements. It is exceptional even in Bengal, the home of cholera, that Englishmen there are attacked by the disease. It is true, also, in unsanitary localities in Southern and Eastern Europe, that the intelligent and well-to-do classes suffer greatly during a cholera epidemic. There is but little danger of the class of people who constitute the cabin passengers of the transatlantic steamer bringing with them, either in their persons or in their clothing, the infection of cholera.

The establishment of a policy of non-intercourse, *so far as immigration is concerned*, when Europe is suffering severely from a cholera epidemic would, in my opinion, constitute the best, and perhaps the only, means of safeguarding the United States from the ravages of this disease. I have repeatedly had occasion, in several publications, to point out the dangerous state of imperfection at several of the Atlantic quarantine stations known to my personal knowledge to exist. The ports of Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore would certainly, in their permanent establishments and in their limited corps of administration, be unable to cope successfully, for any long period, with an invasion of the immigrants allowed to come incessantly to our shores during cholera epidemics in Europe. Even the quarantine station at New York—the largest and the most completely equipped of all our quarantine stations—would, with the frequent arrival of transatlantic steamers carrying infected immigrants with pestiferous baggage, quickly reach the point of uncertain defence and would be overwhelmed, unless indeed the policy of long detention of travellers, ships, and cargoes were rigidly enforced—a policy which would involve tremendous financial losses to those engaged in maritime trade or associated, directly or indirectly, with maritime commerce. The capacity of the New York quarantine is reached for purposes of safe defence with the landing of, say, one thousand immigrants held for observation. We have already seen how soon, with an uninterrupted stream of immigrants from infected localities, the capacity of this, our most capacious quarantine station, has been strained to the utmost.

The placing of an embargo *on immigration only* would be the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most direct means of securing safety from cholera and would not be coupled with the impediments to trade involved in long detention of ships and cargoes or annoying restrictions upon the movements of those travellers little likely to introduce infection. It is needless to point out that with the ship's inhabitants limited to the crew and the cabin passengers, the quarantine station of New York could, in its present condition, be relied upon to guard the country against the introduction of cholera through that port. The present arrangements that have been temporarily made and placed in operation at the quarantine stations of Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore—imperfect as these stations are in permanent facilities—would also be in little or no danger of being overwhelmed by the exigencies of such a situation.

The inadequate permanent establishments at most of our maritime quarantine stations and the apparent impossibility (except perhaps when confronted with emergencies such as the recent emergency) of obtaining appropriations from local authorities of sufficient money to erect extensive and complete quarantine establishments in accordance with modern science and accurate knowledge of the nature, the mode of spreading, and the means of preventing cholera are further and, to my mind, incontrovertible reasons why the public cannot rely upon independent local quarantines for the defence of the whole country against the introduction of the common epidemics, much less of epidemics of cholera, which are the most dangerous of all and the most difficult to arrest. In this connection the question may be very pertinently asked: Why, then, should the direction, expense, and responsibility of a system of common defence against the inroads of foreign diseases, any more than against invasions of foreign foes, be assumed and borne by those municipalities or States that happen to have a maritime location? Why should the vast majority located inland be allowed to shift their responsibilities and obligations or be denied a voice in the direction of affairs which so closely concern them? The protection of the public health by maritime quarantine is a matter that interests not merely a narrow belt of sea-coast; it seriously concerns the whole of the vast territory between our shores. *Salus populi suprema lex.* This fundamental principle of the laws of ancient Rome should broadly underlie the legal code of every wisely-governed land. I am treating here, it must not be forgotten, of measures which affect many interests, which often violate personal liberty. Complaints are therefore inevitable.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The objections of any weight urged against maritime quarantine as a means of protecting the public health from preventable diseases imported by sea are only two: first, the alleged failures to keep out these diseases by this means; secondly, the alleged injury to maritime trade. In my opinion, the first objection finds a complete answer and explanation in the grossly imperfect state and the maladministration of the quarantine defences almost everywhere. This is not the place to enter into a detailed discussion of the numerous facts which can be arrayed in support of this opinion. Those who wish to know the full truth concerning this matter may consult my "Report on Cholera in Europe and India" and other similar publications. It seems, therefore, absurd to argue against the capabilities of a thoroughly-equipped maritime quarantine, strictly and wisely administered, from the historic failures of those establishments which have been obviously deficient in the essential requirements of a maritime quarantine.

The second objection is always a serious one for a people extensively engaged in maritime trade. But it is met, I think, by a due consideration in the light of present knowledge of the wide and essential difference between the requirements for proper treatment of the ship's cargo and the ship's inhabitants. It is the ship's inhabitants with their personal effects that almost invariably introduce the infectious germs into this country; the merchandise rarely or never conveys the contagion, with the exception of wool and rags, and possibly also some forms of edibles from districts or ports infected. There is no excuse in the treatment of ships with cholera, small-pox, scarlet fever, diphtheria aboard, to detain the cargoes in quarantine for a long period. With adequate facilities at hand the proper disinfection of the ship itself need not require her detention or that of the cargo longer than a few hours—an impediment to trade too insignificant to be taken into account when the paramount interests of the public health are considered. It is just the absence of facilities for handling the ship's inhabitants and treating them and their personal effects which has made it impossible to avoid great impositions upon the course of trade where quarantine must needs be enforced.

With regard to the detention at quarantine of those of the ship's inhabitants who are well, it need be prolonged but little beyond the period of incubation of the particular disease against which the quarantine is directed. If none of the immigrant classes are on board the detention may safely be much shorter. The inconvenience of this detention the travelling and immigrant classes alone suffer, the com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mercial interests of the general public being but little disturbed thereby, if only the proper facilities are at hand. In the great majority of instances, however, it is among the immigrants only that actual cases of disease exist and in their apparel and baggage that infection lurks; and when we consider the advantages which the immigrant is about to receive, the necessary detention is but a small sacrifice for him to make for the benefit of the people among whom he seeks a home.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I would therefore uphold the following propositions:

A. *National supremacy in the control of quarantine is necessary.*

1. It is only in this way that the necessary protection against the importation of epidemic diseases in all our ports can be constantly secured.

2. It is the only practical mode by which uniformity of establishment and administration, regard being had to the modification required by difference of latitude and other circumstances, can be assured. Such necessary uniformity can be obtained by no other arrangement, for the reason that the National Government alone is able to defray the expense of complete quarantine establishments at every port, according to the requirements of each and without regard to the revenue derived from the shipping of any.

3. The benefits of quarantine inure to the welfare of the whole country; therefore it is just that money should be as freely expended when necessary at one port as at another, without respect to their relative commercial importance or to the amount of revenue collected in the shape of boarding and inspection fees, etc. It is manifestly unjust that the seaboard cities and States should be obliged to bear the entire expense of quarantine establishments whose most important function should be the protection of the inhabitants of every region of the vast territory of the United States.

4. A national quarantine, properly administered and conducted by trained officials accustomed to deal with contagious and infectious diseases, would tend to prevent panic, to allay undue anxiety, and to favor a reasonable sense of security.

5. Experience has shown that much needless alarm, as well as preventable danger, arises upon the appearance of an unfamiliar epidemic disease at quarantine stations; as when cholera has shown itself at New Orleans or New York or yellow fever in Philadelphia or Boston. A national quarantine would very greatly lessen the neces-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sity for vexatious temporary interstate quarantines, which so seriously disturb inland trade.

6. A national quarantine system, directed in such a manner as to meet fully the requirements of existing sanitary knowledge, would not adversely disturb any commercial interest. It would, on the contrary, do away with many of the embarrassments incident to maritime trade due to lack of proper facilities and to maladministration of existing local regulations, and would avoid the enforcement of measures which are unnecessary and are prompted by a state of panic due to ignorance of the best methods of prevention.

7. A national quarantine would not necessarily supersede any existing arrangements regarded by local authorities as expedient for their own protection. It would constitute another line of defence under exclusive control of the National Government; and it should be conducted wholly without extra cost to shipping, and should thus work no additional pecuniary hardship, even if the present fees were still to be exacted by the local authorities for the maintenance of their own establishments.

8. The ability of the National Government by an existing act of Congress to come to the aid of local quarantine authorities in answer to the appeal of the Executive of any State in time of grave danger implies a function of very narrow scope and uncertain application. Appeals of this kind are likely to be deferred until the emergency is extreme and the aid obtained from the Government is therefore likely to be rendered too late to accomplish its most important purpose, namely, the prevention of an invasion.

B. *A national organization would secure advantages not attainable by independent local quarantine establishments, however complete.*

Among many other advantages the following may be enumerated:

1. Suitably-arranged and commodious buildings for the housing of ships' inhabitants and for the care of the sick, etc., provided with necessary furniture and appliances, at all ports.

2. An efficient corps of trained officials and assistants always on duty and an able corps of sanitary engineers and of police.

3. The practicability of the concentration of force, money, and attention at any threatened port without loss of time.

4. Officials under the control of the National Government and free from local, political, and commercial influences of rival ports.

5. The objects of quarantine would be furthered by full and reliable consular reports and sanitary inspection of emigrants at ports of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

embarkation, functions properly belonging to officials of the General Government.

The organization of a supreme national quarantine system in the United States should require:

1. That the whole matter be placed under an appropriate department of the General Government, with a central bureau of control constituted by the ablest sanitary experts in the country and established at Washington.

2. A sufficient corps of medical officers and assistants, with nurses, sanitary police, laundrymen, engineers, and officers and crews for boarding tugs, organized at every station. Among the requirements for the medical service should be a speaking knowledge of at least two modern European languages besides English—say of German and Italian. In view of the frequent and systematic attempts to falsify the ship's log for the purpose of concealing the existence of infectious disease during the voyage, the health-officers should be able when necessary to go among the passengers and themselves closely question them, without the mediation of an interpreter. The establishment of one or more schools and laboratories for sanitary instruction and research for all persons connected with this service would be an advantage. In addition to the men on duty at the respective stations there should be a sufficient number of medical and other officials, fully trained in quarantine duties and familiar with contagious diseases, unattached and available for immediate auxiliary service at any threatened port. The service should be permanent, the pay ample, employment and promotion should depend on fitness shown by searching examinations, and there should be a uniform and comparative military rank in order to develop and maintain a strong *esprit de corps*.

3. The erection of necessary hospital and other buidings, wharves, disinfecting apparatus, wash-houses, *latrines*, etc., in suitable localities, when possible, upon islands at or near the entrances to harbors and at some distance from the main channel.

4. These stations should be organized and fully equipped at every port of entry on the coast, in such manner as to meet the requirements of each port in the measure of its commerce and immigration and of the special diseases to which it is most exposed.

5. The cost of the establishment and maintenance of the national quarantine should be provided for by appropriation from the National Treasury, and not by fees exacted from vessels.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It must be remembered, however, that the danger from immigrants would not be entirely banished though the quarantine of the coast of the United States were perfect; for the way through the British provinces and through Mexico would still be open to these travellers. In the absence of efficient quarantine inspection in the St. Lawrence River and in Nova Scotia, the attempt to protect ourselves thoroughly from importations of epidemics would necessitate the doubtful and difficult expedient of a land quarantine along our northern frontier. The attempt to exclude these objectionable and, at this time, particularly dangerous, classes from entrance through our Atlantic ports when they come immediately from Europe, coupled with the determination to admit them *via* North and South America—as I understand is proposed by Senator Chandler's committee—would certainly be fraught with great danger to the public health as well as productive of unfair advantages in favor of Canadian, Mexican, and West Indian ports and steamship lines, not to mention discrimination in favor of Canadian and Mexican railways. The diversion to those countries of swarms of European immigrants who are destined to some point in the United States would be the inevitable result of such incomplete legislation. The health of the country would probably be as much jeopardized ultimately as if the great masses of immigration were still allowed to come direct and pass through our own maritime ports. Universal experience proves that land quarantines are always more difficult of effective enforcement than the maritime. If indeed the object of this proposed discrimination be to favor the Chicago Fair, by all means admit *citizens* of North and South America who can show proper passports; but if we are to adopt the very best means of escaping a devastating epidemic of cholera next year, the exclusion of European emigrants must be general and rigid. The more efficient plan would be to have the same precautions taken at the ports in the British provinces and Mexico as would be practised in the United States; but this course could be secured only through treaty or international agreement, which our local authorities are not competent to make.

Harmony in provisions of law relating to quarantine in the United States, in Canada, and in Mexico seems indispensable for the full protection of our extensive northern and southern frontiers, and our National Government should be strongly urged to obtain proper conventions with the Canadian authorities relating to such an important matter of common interest and with the Mexican government.

In conclusion, I would especially invite the attention of our national

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legislators to the following facts and suggestions: While cholera appears to have nearly died out in northwestern Europe, it seems to be still lingering in epidemic form in the southeastern portion of that continent. From reliable information, in part from reports of the United States consuls to the Department of State at Washington, it is certain that a great portion of the immigration to this country from southern Russia and southeastern Europe, as well as from central and northern Russia, Poland, and Germany, embarks at Hamburg, Antwerp, and Havre; much of that which proceeds from southern Russia and Hungary passes through Switzerland and across France to take ship at Havre; while not a little goes by ship from Odessa to Marseilles, thence by rail also to Havre for transportation to America. These facts would seem to indicate a necessity for the continuance at the present time of the embargo on immigration, at least so long as we have any news of the existence of cholera in southeastern Europe.

It is a well-known fact that in the past, whenever cholera has obtained a foothold in Europe, it has never disappeared from that continent in less than from three to ten years. While the cold of winter has usually been sufficient apparently to exterminate the disease in most parts of Europe, it yet has always remained dormant in other portions of the continent which have less severe climates, to reappear with renewed virulence at the approach of the next warm season. We have no reason to believe that this visitation of Europe by cholera will prove an exception in this respect to the rule which heretofore has had no exception. The mode of assault of a nation by cholera may be compared somewhat to the attack of the rattlesnake, which usually sounds a note of warning before striking his fatal blow. The history of cholera epidemics shows that threatened peoples, as a rule, receive ample warning of danger. We have received our warning. Let it be followed by the enactment of such national legislation this winter as will render our defences doubly secure against the danger of an invasion next summer.

EDWARD O. SHAKESPEARE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT IS A NOVEL?

My answer can only be a statement of opinion, which I make with much deference to the prejudices of my brethren. Whether it will be of interest to general readers I do not know; but the question I propose is in itself more or less vital as regards novel-writing. No one will deny that truism. Before going to work it is important to know what one means to do. I pretend, however, to no special gift for solving problems in general or this one in particular. To give "the result of one's experience," as the common phrase puts it, is by no means so easy as it sounds. An intelligent man mostly knows what he means by his own words, but it does not follow that he can convey that meaning to others. Almost all discussion and much misunderstanding may fairly be said to be based upon the difference between the definitions of common terms as understood by the two parties. In the exact sciences there is no such thing as discussion; there is the theorem and its demonstration, there is the problem and its solution, from which solution and demonstration there is no appeal. That is because, in mathematics, every word is defined before it is used and is almost meaningless until it has been defined.

It has been remarked by a very great authority concerning the affairs of men that "there is no end of the making of books," and to judge from appearances the statement is even more true to-day than when it was first made. Especially of the making of novels there is no end, in these times of latter-day literature. No doubt many wise and good persons and many excellent critics devoutly wish that there might be; but they are not at present strong enough to stand against us, the army of fiction-makers, because we are many, and most of us do not know how to do anything else, and have grown gray in doing this particular kind of work, and are dependent upon it for bread as well as butter; and lastly and chiefly, because we are heavily backed, as a body, by the capital of the publisher, of which we desire to obtain for ourselves as much as possible. Therefore novels will continue to be written, perhaps for a long time to come. There is a demand for them and there is profit in producing them. Who shall pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vent us, authors and publishers, from continuing the production and supplying the demand?

This brings with it a first answer to the question, "What is a novel?" A novel is a marketable commodity, of the class collectively termed "luxuries," as not contributing directly to the support of life or the maintenance of health. It is of the class "artistic luxuries" because it does not appeal to any of the three material senses—touch, taste, smell; and it is of the class "intellectual artistic luxuries," because it is not judged by the superior senses—sight and hearing. The novel, therefore, is an intellectual artistic luxury—a definition which can be made to include a good deal, but which is, in reality, a closer one than it appears to be at first sight. No one, I think, will deny that it covers the three principal essentials of the novel as it should be, of a story or romance, which in itself and in the manner of telling it shall appeal to the intellect, shall satisfy the requirements of art, and shall be a luxury, in that it can be of no use to a man when he is at work, but may conduce to peace of mind and delectation during his hours of idleness. The point upon which people differ is the artistic one, and the fact that such differences of opinion exist makes it possible that two writers as widely separated as Mr. Henry James and Mr. Rider Haggard, for instance, find appreciative readers in the same year of the same century—a fact which the literary history of the future will find it hard to explain.

Probably no one denies that the first object of the novel is to amuse and interest the reader. But it is often said that the novel should instruct as well as afford amusement, and the "novel-with-a-purpose" is the realization of this idea. We might invent a better expression than that clumsy translation of the neat German "*Tendenz-Roman*." Why not compound the words and call the odious thing a "purpose-novel"? The purpose-novel, then, proposes to serve two masters, besides procuring a reasonable amount of bread and butter for its writer and publisher. It proposes to escape from any definition of the novel in general and make itself an "intellectual moral lesson" instead of an "intellectual artistic luxury." It constitutes a violation of the unwritten contract tacitly existing between writer and reader. So far as supply and demand are concerned, books in general and works of fiction in particular are commodities and subject to the same laws, statutory and traditional, as other articles of manufacture. A toy-dealer would not venture to sell real pistols to little boys as pop-guns, and a gun-maker who should try to sell the latter for Colt's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolvers would get into trouble, even though he were able to prove that the toy was as expensive to manufacture as the real article, or more so, silver-mounted, chiselled, and lying in a Russia-leather case. I am not sure that the law might not support the purchaser in an action for damages if he discovered at a critical moment that his revolver was a plaything. It seems to me that there is a similar case in the matter of novels. A man buys what purports to be a work of fiction, a romance, a novel, a story of adventure, pays his money, takes his book home, prepares to enjoy it at his ease, and discovers that he has paid a dollar for somebody's views on socialism, religion, or the divorce laws.

Such books are generally carefully suited with an attractive title. The binding is as frivolous as can be desired. The bookseller says it is "a work of great power," and there is probably a sentimental dedication on the fly-leaf to a number of initials to which a romantic appearance is given by the introduction of a stray "St." and a few hyphens. The buyer is possibly a conservative person, of lukewarm religious convictions, whose life is made barren by "marriage, or death, or division"—and who takes no sort of interest in the laws relating to divorce, in the invention of a new religion, or the position of the labor question. He has simply paid money, on the ordinary tacit contract between furnisher and purchaser, and he has been swindled, to use a very plain term for which a substitute does not occur to me. Or say that a man buys a seat in one of the regular theatres. He enters, takes his place, preparing to be amused, and the curtain goes up. The stage is set as a church, there is a pulpit before the prompter's box, and the Right Reverend, the Bishop of the Diocese, is on the point of delivering a sermon. The man would be legally justified in demanding his money at the door, I fancy, and would probably do so, though he might admit that the Bishop was the most learned and edifying of preachers. There are indeed certain names and prefixes to names which suggest serious reading, independently of the words printed on the title-page of the book. If the Archbishop of Canterbury, or General Booth, or the Emperor William published a novel, for instance, the work might reasonably be expected to contain an exposition of personal views on some question of the day. But in ordinary cases the purpose-novel is a simple fraud, besides being a failure in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand.

What we call a novel may educate the taste and cultivate the intelligence; under the hand of genius it may purify the heart and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fortify the mind; it should never under any circumstances be suffered to deprave the one or to weaken the other; it may stand for scores of years—and a score of years is a long time in our day—as the exposition of all that is noble, heroic, honest, and true in the life of woman or man; but it has no right to tell us what its writer thinks about the relations of labor and capital, nor to set up what the author conceives to be a nice, original, easy scheme of salvation, any more than it has a right to take for its theme the relative merits of the "broomstick-car" and the "storage system," temperance, vivisection, or the "Ideal Man" of Confucius. Lessons, lectures, discussions, sermons, and didactics generally belong to institutions set apart for especial purposes and carefully avoided, after a certain age, by the majority of those who wish to be amused. The purpose-novel is an odious attempt to lecture people who hate lectures, to preach at people who prefer their own church, and to teach people who think they know enough already. It is an ambush, a lying-in-wait for the unsuspecting public, a violation of the social contract—and as such it ought to be either mercilessly crushed or forced by law to bind itself in black and label itself "Purpose" in very big letters.

In art of all kinds the moral lesson is a mistake. It is one thing to exhibit an ideal worthy to be imitated, though inimitable in all its perfection, but so clearly noble as to appeal directly to the sympathetic string that hangs untuned in the dullest human heart; to make man brave without arrogance, woman pure without prudishness, love enduring yet earthly, not angelic, friendship sincere but not ridiculous. It is quite another matter to write a "guide to morality" or a "handbook for practical sinners" and call either one a novel, no matter how much fiction it may contain. Wordsworth tried the moral lesson and spoiled some of his best work with botany and the Bible. A good many smaller men than he have tried the same thing since, and have failed. Perhaps "Cain" and "Manfred" have taught the human heart more wisdom than "Matthew" or the unfortunate "idiot boy" over whom Byron was so mercilessly merry. And yet Byron probably never meant to teach any one anything in particular, and Wordsworth meant to teach everybody, including and beginning with himself.

I do not wish to be accused of what is called smart writing. It is much easier to attack than to defend and much more blessed to give hard knocks than to receive them. A professed novelist is perhaps not a competent judge of novels from the point of view which interests the reader, and which is of course the reader's own. We know the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"*technique*" of the trick better than the effect it produces, just as it is hard for a conjuror to realize the sensations of the old gentleman in the audience who finds a bowl of gold-fish in his waistcoat pocket. We do not all know one another's tricks, but we have a fair idea of the general principle on which they are done and a very definite opinion about our own business as compared with that of the parson or the professor. We know our books from the inside and we see the strings of the puppets, while the public only guesses at the mechanism as it sits before the stage, watching the marionettes and listening to the voice from behind the scenes. A novel is, after all, a play, and perhaps it is nothing but a substitute for the real play with live characters, scene-shifting, and footlights. But miracle-plays have gone out of fashion in modern times, except at Ober-Ammergau. The purpose-novel is a miracle-play—and if it be true that any really good novel can be dramatized, nothing short of a miracle could put a purpose-novel on the boards.

Most people have a very clear conception of what a good play ought to be and of the precise extent to which realism can be effective without being offensive. But it is strange, and it is a bad sign of the times, that persons who would not tolerate a coarse play read novels little, if at all, short of indecent. An answer suggests itself which may be comprehensive as an explanation, but is insufficient as an excuse. In our Anglo-Saxon social system the young girl is everywhere, and, if the shade of Sterne will allow me to say so, we temper the wind of our realism to the sensitive innocence of the ubiquitous lamb. Once admit that the young girl is to have the freedom of our theatre, and it follows, and ought to follow and very generally does follow, that our plays must be suited to maiden ears and eyes. It is a good thing that this should be so, but the effect is rather strange. The men who hear plays in English are not, perhaps, much more moral than their contemporaries of Paris, Vienna, and Berlin. We like to believe that our women are better than those of foreign nations. We owe it to them to put more faith in them because they are our own, our dear mothers and wives and sisters and daughters, for whom, if we be men, we mean to do all that men can do. But we are all men and women nevertheless, and human, and we have the thoughts and the understanding of men and women and not of school-girls. Yet the school-girl practically decides what we are to hear at the theatre and, so far as our own language is concerned, determines to a great extent what we are to read.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet the taste for "realism" is abroad and in opposition to all this. Out of the conflict arises that very curious production, the realistic novel in English—than which no effort of human genius has sailed nearer to the wind, so to say, since Goethe wrote his "Elective Affinities," which an Anglo-Saxon young girl pronounced to be "a dull book all about gardening." That our prevailing moral literary purity is to some extent assumed—not fictitious—is shown by the undeniable fact that women who blush scarlet and men who feel an odd sensation of repulsion in reading some pages of "Tom Jones" or "Peregrine Pickle," are not conscious of any particular shock when their sensibilities are attacked in French. Some of them call Zola a "pig" with great directness, but read all his books industriously and very often admit the fact. When they call him names they forget that he writes for a great public of men and women—not young girls—and when they read him he makes them remember that he is a great man—mistaken perhaps, possibly bad, mightily coarse to no purpose, but great nevertheless—a Nero of fiction. But Zola's shadow, seen through the veil of the English realistic novel, is a monstrosity not to be tolerated. We see the apparent contradiction in our own taste between our theory and our practice in reading, but we feel instinctively that there is a foundation of justice to account for the seeming discrepancy. Both are coarse, but the one is great and bold and the other is damned by its own smallness and meanness. The result of the desire for realism in men who try to write realistic novels for the clean-minded American and English girl is unsatisfactory. It is generally a photograph, not a picture—a catalogue, not a description.

A community of vices is a closer and more direct bond between human beings than a community of virtues. This may be because vice needs solidarity among those who yield to it in order to be tolerated at all, whereas virtue is its own reward, as the proverb says, and is happily very often its own protection—far more often than not in our day. This seems to be the reason why the realistic method is better suited to the exposition of what is bad than of what is good. Wordsworth and Swinburne are two realistic poets. Most people do not hesitate to call Wordsworth the greater man. I need not express an opinion which few would care to hear, but so far as the relative effect of their works is concerned it can hardly be denied that, of the two, Swinburne appeals far more strongly and directly to sinful humanity as it is. Wordsworth speaks to the higher and more spiritual part of us, indeed, but too often in language which rouses

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no response in the more human side of man's nature which is most generally uppermost. These are but illustrations of my meaning, not examples, which latter should be taken among novelists—a task, however, which may be left to the discriminating reader.

It has always seemed to me that the perfect novel, as it ought to be, exists somewhere in the state of the Platonic idea, waiting to be set down on paper by the first man of genius who receives a direct literary inspiration. It must deal chiefly with love. For in that passion all men and women are most generally interested, either for its present reality or for the memories that soften the coldly vivid recollection of an active past and shed a tender light in the dark places of by-gone struggles, or because the hope of it brightens and gladdens the path of future dreams. The perfect novel must be clean and sweet, for it must tell its tale to all mankind, to saint and sinner, pure and defiled, just and unjust. It must have the magic to fascinate and the power to hold its reader from first to last. Its realism must be real, of three dimensions, not flat and photographic; its romance must be of the human heart and truly human, that is, of the earth as we all have found it; its idealism must be transcendent, not measured to man's mind but proportioned to man's soul. Its religion must be of such grand and universal span as to hold all worthy religions in itself. Conceive, if possible, such a story, told in a language that can be now simple, now keen, now passionate, and now sublime; or rather, pray, do not conceive it, for the modern novelist's occupation would suddenly be gone, and that one book would stand alone of its kind, making all others worse than useless—ridiculous, if not sacrilegious, by comparison.

Why must a novel-writer be either a "realist" or a "romantist"? And, if the latter, why "romanticist" any more than "realisticist"? Why should a good novel not combine romance and reality in just proportions? Is there any reason to suppose that the one element must necessarily shut out the other? Both are included in every-day life, which would be a very dull affair without something of the one and would be decidedly incoherent without the other. Art, if it is "to create and foster agreeable illusions," as Napoleon is believed to have said of it, should represent the real, but in such a way as to make it seem more agreeable and interesting than it actually is. That is the only way to create "an agreeable illusion," and by no other means can a novel do good while remaining a legitimate novel and not becoming a sermon, a treatise, or a polemic.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may reasonably be inquired whether the prevailing and still growing taste for fiction expresses a new and enduring want of educated men and women. The novel, as we understand the word, is after all a very recent invention. Considering that we do not find it in existence until late in the last century, its appearance must be admitted to have been very sudden, its growth fabulously rapid, and its development enormous. The ancients had nothing more like it than a few collections of humorous and pathetic stories. The Orientals, who might be supposed to feel the need of it even more than we do, had nothing but their series of fantastic tales strung rather loosely together without general plan. Men and women seem to have survived the dulness of the dark age with the help of the itinerant story-teller. The novel is a distinctly modern invention, satisfying a modern want. In the ideal state described with so much accuracy by Mr. Bellamy, I believe the novel would not sell. It would be incomprehensible or it would not be a novel at all, according to our understanding. Do away practically with the struggle for life, eliminate all the unfit and make the surviving fittest perfectly comfortable—men and women might still take a curious interest in our present civilization, but it would be of a purely historical nature. To gratuitously invent a tale of a poor man fighting for success would seem to them a piece of monstrously bad taste and ridiculously useless. Are we tending to such a state as that? There are those who believe that we are—but a faith able to remove mountains at "cut rates" will not be more than enough to realize their hopes.

It may fairly be claimed that humanity has, within the past hundred years, found a way of carrying a theatre in its pocket, and so long as humanity remains what it is it will delight in taking out its pocket-stage and watching the antics of the actors, who are so like itself and yet so much more interesting. Perhaps that is, after all, the best answer to the question, "What is a novel?" It is, or ought to be, a pocket-stage. Scenery, light, shade, the actors themselves, are made of words and nothing but words, more or less cleverly put together. A play is good in proportion as it represents the more dramatic, passionate, romantic, or humorous sides of real life. A novel is excellent according to the degree in which it produces the illusions of a good play—but it must not be forgotten that the play is the thing, and that illusion is eminently necessary to success.

Every writer who has succeeded has his own methods of creating such illusion. Some of us are found out and some of us are not, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we all do the same thing in one way or another, consciously or unconsciously. The tricks of the art are without number, simple or elaborate, easily learned or hard to imitate, and many of us consider that we have a monopoly of certain tricks we call our own and are unreasonably angry when a competitor makes use of them.

But this is not the place for a study of methods. So far as I have been able, I have answered the question I asked, and which stands at the head of this article. But I have answered it in my own way. What am I, a novel-writer, trying to do? I am trying, with such limited means as I have at my disposal, to make little pocket-theatres out of words. I am trying to be architect, scene-painter, upholsterer, dramatist, and stage manager, all at once. Is it any wonder if we novelists do not succeed as well as we could wish, when we try to be masters of so many trades?

F. Marion Crawford.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT IMMIGRANTS CONTRIBUTE TO INDUSTRY.

"The genius of the country has marked out our true policy—opportunity. Opportunity of civil rights, of education, of personal power, and not less of wealth; doors wide open. If I could have it—free trade with all the world without toll or custom-houses, invitations as we now make to every nation, to every race and skin, white men, red men, yellow men, black men; hospitality of fair field and equal laws to all. Let them compete, and success to the strongest, the wisest, and the best. The land is wide enough, the soil has bread for all."—*Ralph Waldo Emerson's Lecture on "The Fortune of the Republic."*

THE question of restricting the immigration into the United States of persons born in other lands is not a new one. It has been suggested and discussed by every generation since the thirteen struggling colonies were successful in forming a government for the conduct of their own affairs. Even before internal problems of the most pressing kind were solved, many men became apprehensive lest the new experiment should fail if foreign persons were not turned back from the shores of this country. But the news that work was to be had travelled fast. Then began that great movement of men which is still in progress.

The demand for the restriction of immigration, as it now exists, can be traced to two influences. It is probably due most directly to the efforts of the people of the Pacific coast first to restrict and ultimately to prohibit the coming of people from China. No sooner did the handful of inhabitants beyond the Rocky Mountains find that the Chinese had built their railroads, constructed their reservoirs and irrigating canals, and planted their vineyards, than they began a clamor, raised by the unreasonable members of labor organizations and abetted by demagogues, against the further admission of Chinese. When this agitation was crowned with success it was only natural that its advocates, their sympathizers and successors, should seek new worlds to conquer. So, when a considerable contingent of Italians, Hungarians, and Poles began to arrive to do the necessary and honorable work awaiting their strong and willing hands, just as the Chinese had done before them, the cry went up to Congress that American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor was imperilled and the integrity or perpetuity of our institutions endangered.

The other influence that has suggested restriction as a possible policy is our fiscal system. After protective laws had been in operation some twenty years, and organized labor had assumed an importance never before known or possible, the leaders of these organizations began to doubt whether they and their fellows were getting their share of the work to be done. It was then claimed that there was a tariff on goods for the benefit of the manufacturers and that the laborers then in the country, together with their children, ought, in justice, to have a monopoly of all the work to be done here. It was clearly a case of like producing like. On the one hand, the beneficiaries of an unjust and inequitable fiscal system avowed their intention to let in no manufactured product, their purpose being to create for themselves a monopoly of the domestic market. On the other hand, the laborers, who in some way thought themselves cheated, proposed to reserve for themselve an absolute monopoly of the market for labor. This new agitation has thus far produced no other results than the enactment of a ridiculous law forbidding entrance to persons who have made contracts which would enable them to go to work immediately upon arrival, and the assertion by the Federal Government of the ordinary police power of towns, parishes, or counties, under which it deals with paupers, insane, and criminals in such a way as to provide that they shall not come here to become public charges.

There is very little sentiment in this matter of immigration. It is purely a matter of business. In some parts of the world there are too many people for the work there is to do; in other parts, our country among them, there is more work than there are people to do it. Whenever in the history of the world these conditions have arisen, the redundant population has left the soil upon which it was born and has gone out to seek and to do the work of other lands. The process began with Adam and has been going on ever since.

No records of immigration were kept until 1821, but it has been estimated, perhaps with reasonable accuracy, that about two hundred and fifty thousand persons came here from foreign countries, as intending settlers, between the time of Washington's inauguration in 1789 and the beginning of Monroe's second term in 1821. Since the latter time the number is known with substantial accuracy, and since the beginning of our sixth decennial period, completed by the publication

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the census report for 1850, the number of foreign-born persons resident in the United States, with their distribution, occupations, social condition, and rate of increase, natural and by immigration, have all become well-known facts.

In 1880 the proportion of foreign-born people drawn from Teutonic countries and Ireland was about 91 per cent of the whole number of foreign-born. Of the immigration for the ten years since that time, 81 per cent was drawn from the same sources. Of course the Irish included in these returns are not, strictly speaking, part of the Teutonic races, but since their country is a subject one they fall of necessity into this classification. These figures of themselves answer the charge, so often made, that the character of our immigration has changed because considerable accessions have been made from Latin countries, and Magyars, Czechs, and Semites have come. Opposition now to the immigration of Italians and Hungarians is as unreasonable as was the prejudice against the Irish thirty-five years ago.

The Italians come from a country whose people within the past half-century have made a greater comparative advance than any in Europe. Freeing themselves almost simultaneously from ecclesiastical and foreign domination, they have won a recognized place as one of the great powers of Europe. The regeneration of Italy is one of the stupendous facts of the century. While the struggle was going on she was able to command practically the united support of our people, but now that a few hundred thousand of the countrymen of Columbus have come here they are met with a storm of abuse and with ignorant denunciation. No immigration ought to be more welcome than this. They are a strong, sturdy class of people, who come here to do work that must be done, if our industries are to suffer no hurt. The Irish have ceased building railroads and doing the hard labor of constructing great public works. The Italians have taken their places, and it is the universal testimony that no more faithful men have come among us. The same is true in many respects of the Hungarians. When Kossuth was carrying on a brave but futile contest for Hungarian liberty he commanded the very general support of our people. This immigration comes from a people distinguished from the earliest days of its history by love of liberty, hospitable customs, industry, frugality, and endurance.

The Jewish influx from Russia has recently been unnaturally large, as the result of serious complications at home. But these people are not paupers or dependents. They are anxious for work, intelli-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gent, quick to learn our language and customs, and promise, in the fulness of time, to become useful additions to our population.

It is said, too, that many of our German immigrants are Socialists and Anarchists. It is to be doubted whether there are a thousand Anarchists in the United States—men who accept the logic of the doctrines they are supposed to believe. When the Haymarket outrages were perpetrated in Chicago, the leader, the man with the brains and courage to plan and execute, was an American of unquestionable purity of Americanism, so far as lineage could give it to him. So far as socialism is concerned, a United States consul in Germany, reporting to the Department of State in 1886, said: "I learn that it takes no stronger form than a desire for a republican form of government. . . . The number who follow the red rag is below zero." Certainly a political party in a foreign country, with no more radical or destructive doctrine than this, ought not, in such a land as ours, to be deemed dangerous. The only dangerous form of "socialism" to be found in this country is the demand for just such legislation as that combated in this paper: the tendency to look to the Government for favors and to ask, in behalf of individuals or classes, those special privileges that should be accorded to none.

As one outcome of the New Orleans lynching, a noisy demand was made for the prohibition of immigration from Sicily, Corsica, and other Mediterranean islands. It is represented that the people of these islands are leagued together in organizations with the single purpose of committing murder. During the ten years from 1881 to 1890, 307,333 Italians came to this country as immigrants, of which one-half were "temporary" immigrants with passports permitting an absence for one year. Of these, 1,464 came from Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. Since only 1,067 were males of all ages, and as more than half of them were likely to return, it ought to be clear even to the anti-immigration alarmists that the institutions of this country are not to be seriously imperilled by the countrymen of the first Napoleon and their associates from the neighboring isles.

The services rendered by foreign-born men as soldiers, fighting for the struggling colonies in the war for independence, have always been recognized, even if they have never been fully requited. No trustworthy statistics have been gathered of the number of French, Germans, and Irish who allied themselves with the American cause. That each of these nationalities rendered valuable services at delicate times during

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that war is, however, well known. There is almost as little accurate information about the number of foreign-born soldiers in our armies in the second war with Great Britain, in the war with Mexico, and on both sides in the Civil War, as there is about our first armed conflict. We know with accuracy the number, the residence, and the occupations of foreign-born persons in every relation of civil life, during each decade, beginning with 1840. But no compilation has been made by the War Department even of the nativities of the Union soldiers. We know that many regiments and companies were composed entirely of foreigners and that thousands more of them were scattered through every regiment and almost every company. It is known, however, that substantially all the foreigners in this country in 1860 were resident in the Northern Sates and Territories.

It is easier to get a fairly accurate measure of the contribution of the foreign-born population to industrial development. In 1870 this element comprised 14.44 per cent of all the people of the land. This 14.44 per cent furnished 21.62 per cent of the persons engaged in all occupations. In other words, one-seventh of the entire population did something more than one-fifth of all the work.[1]

[1] The following table shows, somewhat in detail, our dependence upon our foreign-born population as indicated by the figures of the census of 1880, the latest available for the purpose:

THE PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN-BORN IN 1880 AND THE PERCENTAGES OF THE FOREIGN-BORN ENGAGED IN OCCUPATIONS.

Population	13.32	Trade and transportation	25.33
Engaged in all occupations	20.09	Manufactures and mechanical and mining industries	31.94
Agriculture	10.59		
Professional and personal services	24.72		

IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS.

Agricultural laborers	04.85	Architects	29.42
Boot and shoe makers	35.75	Chemists and assayers	33.82
Clergymen	19.52	Designers, draughtsmen, inventors	28.25
Cotton, silk, and woollen mill operatives	41.52	Civil engineers	14.11
Domestic servants	24.82	Blacksmiths	33.13
Farmers and planters	14.69	Brewers and maltsters	75.08
Iron and steel workers	37.19	Cabinet-makers, carpenters, joiners	25.21
Laborers	28.15	Carpet-makers	43.55
Lawyers	5.90	Cigar-makers	44.37
Manufacturers	24.90	Locomotive-engineers, firemen	27.36
Miners	53.88	Engravers	21.64
Employees of Government	16.32	Machinists	30.11
Employees of railroad companies	27.28	Masons, marble and stone cutters	37.68
Physicians and surgeons	10.01	Leather workers and tanners	45.30
Sailors, steamboatmen, stevedores, canalmen, pilots, and watermen	24.51	Paper-mill operatives	33.10
Stock-raisers, herders, and drovers	23.24	Printers, lithographers, stereotypers	16.09
Tailors, dressmakers, and milliners	28.00	Ship-builders	32.11
Teachers	07.0	Silk-mill operatives	36.93
Traders and dealers	28.64	Wheelwrights	20.78
		Woollen-mill operatives	39.05

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While the foreign-born population did more than its share of the work of all occupations, it performed considerably less than its part of the work pertaining to agriculture—the single great interest which, during the past twenty years, has not kept full pace with the general development. The distinction may also be noted that while 14.69 per cent of the farmers and planters were foreign-born, only 4.85 per cent of the agricultural laborers were foreign-born. This indicates that when a foreigner goes upon a farm in the country of his adoption, it is as an owner as well as a tiller of the soil. In these days, when we are told much of the necessity for protecting American labor, the great preponderance of foreigners in the manufacturing industries deserves notice from the advocates of this policy, as well as from the promoters of restriction.

To show the dependence upon foreign-born workers, the proportions in fifty principal cities were as follows in 1880: the percentage of the foreign-born in all occupations was 40.07; in professional and personal services, 44.26; in trade and transportation, 34.33; in manufacturing, mechanical, and mining industries, 41.38.

The contention most persistently made by the opponents of immigration is that foreigners have manifested a tendency to congregate in large cities. The scene may shift from New York to Chicago, to St. Louis, or to San Francisco, when the public taste in these cities is under discussion of the result of any experiment in politics or society is announced; but the assertion is calmly made that the people are no longer "American." This statement has been circulated so long and so persistently that a great number of people, perhaps most people, have assumed it to be true, as a matter of course. This fallacy may be more forcibly demonstrated by consulting the census: the percentage of foreign-born in the ten principal cities in 1880 was 31.97, and the percentage of those that were engaged in classifiable occupations was 43.58.

Perhaps next in seriousness to the fallacy that our large cities are becoming more and more foreign is the fallacy that our prisons and almshouses are little more than harbors of refuge for persons born in foreign lands. It is only natural that paupers should be drawn from the ranks of the poor, and it is the experience of society that most of its criminals are drawn from the same classes. But that in either class foreigners abound in alarming disproportion, is not true.

When the details of that important immigration on the first trip made by the "Mayflower" were under discussion and the question

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arose as to which portion of the congregation should leave Holland, it was arranged for "the youngest and strongest part to go." This process of choosing the youngest and strongest part has gone on in obedience to the laws of nature. Of the natives of the United States living here in 1880, only 47.33 per cent were between the vigorous and self-supporting ages of 15 and 50; of the foreign-born, 68.06 per cent were between these ages. This fact of itself serves to explain in some degree the unequal share of work performed by persons of foreign birth. Surely there is not much danger that a population of this kind, with no inherent or abnormal tendency toward mendicity or crime,[1] will be found with nothing better to do than to fill almshouses and prisons.

It would be easy to show the connection between railroad-building and immigration, or between the development of our manufactures and immigration, at different periods, as illustrations of the tendency of idle or ill-paid men to go where work is to be done. Enough facts have, however, been presented to show that the operation of this law has maintained a steady stream of immigration to the United States. If at times it has been overstimulated, it has always regulated itself. While immigration has been large and steady, the return to the land of birth has also been large. If industrial conditions here have been unfavorable, a goodly proportion of immigrants have left us, most of them never to return. Many have found the struggle harder than they thought, and no doubt a part, even after naturalization and a long struggle here, have returned to find refuge from the storms of life in the almshouses of their native towns.

In the ten years from 1876 to 1885, 1,255,652 immigrants came to the United States from Great Britain and Ireland; during the same period 404,203 persons who had emigrated returned. In Italy the government grants passports for a single year, which the immigrant accepts with the purpose, well understood, of seeking work and returning to his own country. The paupers, the unsuccessful, the petty offenders whose crimes have been forgotten or condoned, are far more likely to return to their old haunts and to their miserable comforts than the courageous, the ambitious, and the successful. In this way the sifting process is applied continually without the intervention of laws, restrictive or police. Thus "the youngest and strongest part" are again chosen, to our incalculable advantage.

[1] PAUPERS AND CRIMINALS IN 1860, 1870, AND 1880, NATIVE AND FOREIGN-BORN.

	1860.	1870.	1880.		1860.	1870.	1880.
Paupers	82,942	76,737	66,193	Prisoners	19,086	32,901	58,609
Native	50,483	53,939	43,226	Native	10,143	24,173	45,802
Foreign-born	32,459	22,798	22,967	Foreign-born	8,943	8,728	12,807

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That man must be cold indeed who cannot admire the unflinching courage of the sturdy young people of other lands who, leaving everything dear to them, come here to assist in subduing the earth. So long as they will come, so long as we need them—a question which cannot possibly arise for discussion until our population has multiplied ten or twenty fold—we cannot afford, either in fairness or in humanity, to erect a single barrier against the flow of this tide of men.

GEORGE F. PARKER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ALIEN DEGRADATION OF AMERICAN CHARACTER.

HAS the feeling against immigration any strong, deep root, and will it last? Or is it like the same feeling of fifty years ago which went by the name of Know-Nothingism and passed away?

The Know-Nothing or Native American party began to show signs of life soon after 1830, grew and developed with considerable violence during the forties, and in 1856 appeared as a distinct political organization with Millard Fillmore as its candidate for the presidency. Fillmore's opponents were James Buchanan, the candidate of the Democrats, and John C. Fremont, the candidate of the Republican party, then in its infancy.

The strength of the Know-Nothings is seen in a comparison of the votes. Buchanan received 174 electoral votes, 1,838,169 being his popular vote; Fremont 114 electoral votes and 1,341,264 popular votes; Fillmore 8 electoral votes and 874,534 popular votes. It has been said, and apparently with much truth, that this vote failed to show the full strength of the Know-Nothing feeling. The Know-Nothings were a faction of the Whigs and their successors the Republicans. Thousands of Republicans who strongly sympathized with the Native-American movement refused to vote for its candidate because they were convinced that their votes would be thrown away. They preferred to give them to Fremont, who stood some chance of being elected.

If we trace the rise of the Native-American feeling we find that it always existed in greater or less degree among the Federalists, who were the predecessors of the Whigs. At the very beginning of the Government, after the close of the Revolution, it became a question how the numerous foreigners who had taken part with us in our struggle for liberty should be treated. Washington was emphatic in saying that they should not be given places in the Government, and that, with the exception of Lafayette, it would be well to be rid of all of them. He went even further, and on the general subject of immigration said that we had better not encourage the coming of foreigners of any kind, except a few skilled mechanics in certain arts. During the administration of John Adams a law was passed making a con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinued residence of fourteen years an essential condition of naturalization. Under Democratic influences, this probationary period was afterward changed to five years. In 1814 the Federalists professed to be much disturbed at what they described as the increasing foreign influence. Even Jefferson, though a Democrat, was at one time more outspoken than Washington in his objection to every kind of immigration, and in stating his opinion, used that expression so often used since for other purposes. He wished, he said, that there was an ocean of fire between this country and Europe. His party had not then discovered the value of the foreign vote.

But the rise of the Know-Nothings as a distinct party did not begin until after the great influx of immigrants had begun to attract attention. These immigrants not only came in greater numbers than had ever been known before, but they were not of English race and their religion was Roman Catholic. Up to that time we had been a distinctly English and Protestant people. Any mixture of races among us was slight and unimportant. A few French Huguenots had come to us in colonial times, but they amalgamated so quickly that as a distinct race they were soon lost to sight and could be distinguished only by their names. There was a mixture of Dutch and English in New York, a mixture of Dutch, English, and Swedes in New Jersey, and in Pennsylvania the greatest mixture of all, Dutch, Swedes, English, German, and Scotch-Irish. In fact, Pennsylvania was the only one of the colonies which contained such a thoroughly-mixed population as we have been accustomed to see all over the country in our time. But all the mixture in Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey put together was not enough to give a mixed tone to the country. Massachusetts and the other New England colonies were thoroughly English and so were Virginia and the Southern colonies. From the Revolution to the year 1810 or 1815 there was no immigration worth counting, and the original foreign element of colonial times had been absorbed and overwhelmed by the native growth. In that period our population doubled itself by births alone every twenty-three years, a rate of increase which has never been equalled since, even with the aid of the greatest foreign immigration that could be poured upon us. We were then a homogeneous people in both race and religion and becoming more homogeneous every day.

The shock to this condition of affairs by the swarms of immigrants who came in after the year 1830 was very serious. It is a shock that has been repeated annually ever since. It marked a turning-point in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the history of the United States. It is a chapter that has been neglected by historians; but any one who reads and reflects upon the facts cannot well resist the conclusion that at that time this country turned a sharp corner and started out on new lines.

Many old things came to an end and many new things began. It was about that time that the new form of the Democratic element showed itself, wilder and more unterrified and vindictive than any time before. The old type of statesmen, like Madison and Jefferson, disappeared. Albert Gallatin, the last of them, was about that time chased out of politics, and retired to private life. From that time Webster, who was a continuation of the old line, is described by his biographers as wading against overwhelming currents of popular opinion and striking savage but futile blows against a new order from which his mind revolted and which he could scarcely understand. Before that time political corruption had been occasional and comparatively rare. Since then it has become the order of the day, and only its very great excesses attract attention.

The Know-Nothings, who increased the more this shock was applied to the country, were at times a party of considerable violence. The immigrants were largely adherents of the Pope and connected in the mind of the Native Americans with despotism, union of church and state, the inquisition, and other enormities. Hence the Catholic riots of 1844, and a set of laws still to be found on the statute-books of many States and intended to check the undue accumulation of property in ecclesiastical hands. It was distinctly charged that the immigrants were corrupting the ballot. This charge is repeated in all the pamphlets of that time as something taken for granted and well known. In fact, the opponents of the Know-Nothings often admitted its truth, qualifying it by saying that not all the immigrants were guilty and that the evil could be checked by restrictive laws which would prevent the worst classes from landing. In their early days, the Know-Nothings confined themselves to the one object of protecting the purity of the ballot.

This had first aroused them to their work, and as we look back at those times we can hardly refrain from feeling that it was the most important reason for their existence. It is commonly asserted now that native and foreigner are alike corrupt in politics. But unless we deny the almost universal testimony of fifty years ago, we must believe that during the first half of the present century the native was honest and the foreigner corrupt. If the native is now equally corrupt

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the foreigner, from whom did he learn his corruption? In a pamphlet entitled "Emigration, Emigrants, and Know-Nothings," published in Philadelphia in 1854, the author, who describes himself as a foreigner and an opponent of the Know-Nothings, admits that the native population are being degraded by the foreigner. "Go where you will," he says, "in the United States you find that nearly all the dens of iniquity—taverns, grog-shops, beer-houses, gambling-places, and houses of ill-fame and of worse deeds—are kept by foreigners." Other pamphlets of the time speak in the strongest language of the sudden increase of pauperism and crime. In 1850 the statistics showed one native pauper to every 317 natives and one foreign pauper to every 32 foreigners. In crime, the natives were 1 to 1,619 and the foreigners 1 to 154. The effect of this, it was said, was gradually to degrade the native. "The native population," says the pamphleteer already quoted, "is deteriorated and made poor, needy, and subservient." The native had not only an evil example before him, but he was under-bid, driven from his old employments by a competition which was cheap because it could flourish in dirt and degradation.

But is it true that the native is now equally corrupt with the foreigner? If he is, then so much the worse for the foreigner. The statistics of the census of 1880, however, show that since 1850 the native has managed to hold his own in honesty, and that the foreigner has continued to be the greater criminal. The statistics recently collected by Professor McCook on venal voting in Connecticut point in the same direction. He has given us four tables of both rural and city districts in which the venality of the voters is arranged according to race, intemperance, and other conditions. If we put these together, so far as they show the percentage of venal in each race, and add together the percentages, we shall have a rough estimate which may be good enough for general purposes. This estimate shows that the Irish and Germans, who constitute the large majority of our foreign population, far exceed the American stock in venality. It is also to be observed what a low percentage in venality is assigned to the English. This accords with the fact that before the arrival of the Irish and Germans, when the country was peopled by English or the descendants of Englishmen, there was very little venality and very little political corruption.

Why did the Native-American movement come to an end? A principal cause was undoubtedly the coming on of the Civil War. The party was growing all the time; but four years after its first at-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempt to elect a President of its own faith, the Rebellion burst upon the country and that and the reconstruction period absorbed all our energies for the next ten or fifteen years. It is extremely significant that since the Rebellion and its after-effects were laid to rest this Native American party should spring up again. In its Know-Nothing stage it was undoubtedly a movement in the direction of unity. The feeling of unity characterizes all peoples. Our own Revolution was fought on its lines. We had no material advantage to gain except unity. We were to become one continent, and so the fathers called their army the Continental army and their Congress the Continental Congress, and even gave their money the same name. The Civil War was another stupendous effort of the same sort, and native Americanism, though similar in purpose, had to stand aside. If we look at European history we find that the most important movements of the present century have been the unification of Italy and the unification of Germany.

The Know-Nothings had another difficulty to contend with besides the coming on of the Civil War. Most of their arguments, when viewed from a mere material point of view, seemed very weak. The platform of the party did not advocate the entire exclusion of immigrants as we have now excluded the Chinese and as many would like us to exclude the Irish, the Germans, the Russians, and the Italians. The most radical members of the party went no further than to suggest a capitation tax which should restrict, without stopping, immigration. In the sober utterances of their platform the party confined itself to urging the better control of such importations, a long probationary period for citizenship, and the retention of the reins of government in the hands of the old stock.

But from the point of view of business enterprise and the production of wealth, the general opinion of that time and ever since has been highly favorable to the immigrants. The country was young, with boundless unexplored opportunities, and eager for prosperity and riches. The immigrants would build railroads and work in mills and work cheaply. They would swell the population and increase the productive force. Of course, it was not known then, as it is now, that the immigrants plus their births and plus the births of the natives would not increase the population any faster than the births of the native population alone had increased it before the coming of the immigrants. That the native population should suddenly, after the beginning of the influx, cease to have large families was a fact which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could not have been foreseen. But independently of any consideration of that kind, immigration was regarded as no hindrance whatever, but, on the contrary, a help to material development.

The Know-Nothings were, therefore, at the disadvantage of seeming to oppose the "business interests" of the country. They had to base their arguments on what seemed to be a feeling, a sentiment, or perhaps an instinct. The modern advocates of restriction of immigration are in the same predicament. A glance at the various articles, reports, and investigations on the subject during the last five years shows, so far as material interests are concerned, a strong weight of reason and statistics in favor of the immigrant, except of course that there is good ground shown for closer restriction against those who are professedly paupers, criminals, and anarchists. But the mass of the immigrants do not show characteristics of this sort immediately on arrival. Most of them, although of alien race and language, are able-bodied and apparently respectable. Why should they be excluded?

If you press these reasons on the chance advocate of total restriction whom you meet in the cars or the street he will finally end the conversation by saying, "Well, it has gone on long enough. We have had too much of it. I don't like it." In other words, he retreats to his feeling, his instinct—a feeling, an instinct only, but the instinct of every race and nation and of all mankind. It is not so fierce a feeling, nor so directly practical and concrete, as that other yearning for unity which prevents a country from being dismembered, as in our Civil War, or brings the dismembered fragments together again, as in Italy and Germany. It is of no great assistance in the production of wealth, yet there seem to be some things which cannot be had without it.

It is a noticeable fact in the history of this country that during the Revolution and for fifty years afterward, most of the great men were produced in two commonwealths, Virginia and Massachusetts; and these were the two commonwealths which were more homogeneous than any of the others in race, religion, and general ideas. Massachusetts was all English and all Puritan. Virginia was all English and all Church of England. No one pretends to maintain that any equally numerous set of men has since appeared which equalled those "fathers of the Republic" in the loftiness of their ideals, the wide intelligence of their ability, and the grandeur of their lives.

So far as mere material development is concerned, a mongrel population is as good as any other. If there is never to be anything in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this country save the almighty dollar and the almighty greed for it, then the sooner we stop all this discussion about immigration the better, for it is a waste of time. But the greatest nations, the nations which have achieved the most from a moral standpoint, which have left the most enduring remains in religion, in literature, and in art, have been homogeneous people. The Jews, the Greeks, the French, the English, speak for themselves. All the great schools of art have been national schools, the product of a united and homogeneous people, living the same life, thinking the same thoughts, and sympathizing with each other for a long period of time. Cosmopolitan literature and cosmopolitan art are unknown. The fine arts, as well as all forms of beauty, depend for their excellence on the sympathetic feelings, which are easily alarmed and disgusted. The artistic and the beautiful are for the thoroughbred and are impossible to the cur.

About the year 1825 there began to appear in Massachusetts the beginnings of a great literature. It moved on, and before the time of the Civil War had produced, in their full flower, Longfellow, Emerson, Channing, Prescott, Motley, Hawthorne, and others. It was a complete literature, not a literature like that we have now, consisting only of novels, which, as some one said, describe cups of tea rather than men; but a literature which contained all the departments in the highest state of excellence—poetry, romance, philosophy, history, and theology. The men who produced it were not writing for money. They were not trying to produce stories which would sell because they were of the kind that women want to read. It was a broad, spontaneous, sincere, national literature, produced in one corner of the country which had long been and still remained homogeneous. It began be ore the great immigration set in and it continued for some years afterward. But it is a significant fact that Massachusetts was one of the States which was not reached by the immigrants in any considerable numbers until after the Civil War, and since the immigrants have entered it those brilliant men of literature have left no successors. Since the Irish and French-Canadians began to swarm in twenty years ago, except for the voices of the old survivors of the past, Massachusetts has had no more to say in the higher and greater walks of literature than Arizona.

The modern movement against immigration, if it go on increasing and take definite form, will have many advantages over the Know-Nothingism of 1850. It will avoid the absurdity of being a secret organization and the absurdity of recommending that the foreign-born

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall never hold political office. It will be entirely free from attacks on the Roman Catholics and all the violence and bitterness which that involved. Our people have grown accustomed to the sight of the Roman religion and the fear of it has largely subsided. Whatever designs the priests may have on American institutions, they are not heartily supported in them even by their own laity. After fifty years of effort to substitute the parochial-school system of the Middle Ages for the American public-school system, they are now scarcely any nearer success than they were in the beginning.

The modern movement against immigration will confine itself to its legitimate sphere, which will be the advocacy of a law putting a capitation tax on all immigrants. Absolute exclusion would be difficult to accomplish. We cannot treat the Irish and the Germans, or even the Italians and the Russians, as we do the Chinese. But a high protective tariff on these would exclude the greater number and reduce immigration to a very small stream, which would be neither very polluted nor very dangerous. If we protect ourselves against refined sugar, wool, shot-guns, and works of art, why not against human products which degrade the morals of the country and drive its native owners from profitable callings by under-bidding them in wages?

SYDNEY G. FISHER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PUBLIC-SCHOOL SYSTEM OF NEW YORK CITY.

THE degree of excellence of a school system is represented by the degree of inferiority that the teaching may reach and yet be accepted as satisfactory, or, in other words, by the minimum requirement, by what the teachers are required to do in order that they may retain their positions.

If the teachers are required to use scientific methods as well as secure results, to discard the text-book when things can be learned from observation, to develop the reasoning faculties as well as tax the memory, and to educate the child without robbing him of his happiness, and if those teachers who do not do what is required are promptly stricken from the list, the school system is a healthful and progressive one.

If, on the other hand, the teachers can retain their positions as long as they secure certain *memoriter* results, regardless of the methods employed, regardless of whether in securing the results the children are rendered happy or unhappy, the school system is antiquated and unscientific. And if, in addition, the teachers can retain their positions as long as they choose to do so, however incompetent they may be, the school system is upon the lowest possible level. If, in spite of the latter conditions, bright spots may be found in some of the schools, the system itself is nevertheless upon the lowest level, for the reason that good work is optional and not obligatory, and reflects credit not upon the school system, but upon those individual principals and teachers who are sufficiently interested in their work to do more than is required of them.

Now, what is the character of the instruction that will be passed as satisfactory by the superintendents of the public schools of New York City? Surely no one can call me unjust when I answer this question by describing the work of a school whose principal has been marked uniformly "excellent" during the twenty-five years or more that she has held her present position. I cannot say that this school is a typical New York City primary school—I shall describe

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

typical work later—but I do most positively assert that the mere fact that a superintendent is permitted to give a school of this nature his warmest indorsement is sufficient to prove that the school system of New York City is not conducted for the benefit of the child alone.

The principal of this school has pedagogical views and a maxim peculiarly her own. She believes that when a child enters upon school life his vocabulary is so small that it is practically worthless, and his power to think so feeble that his thoughts are worthless; and she is consequently of the opinion that what the child knows and is able to do on coming to school should be disregarded, and that he should not be allowed to waste time, either in thinking or in finding his own words in which to express thoughts, but that he should be supplied with ready-made thoughts as given in a ready-made vocabulary. She has therefore prepared sets of questions and answers, so that the child may be given in concise form most of the facts prescribed in the course of study for the three years of primary instruction. The instruction throughout the school consists principally of grinding these answers *verbatim* into the minds of the children. The principal's ideal lies in giving each child the ability to answer without hesitation, upon leaving her school, every one of the questions formulated by her. In order to reach the desired end, the school has been converted into the most dehumanizing institution that I have ever laid eyes upon, each child being treated as if he possessed a memory and the faculty of speech, but no individuality, no sensibilities, no soul.

So much concerning the pedagogical views upon which this school is conducted; now as to the maxim. This maxim consists of three short words—"Save the minutes." The spirit of the school is, "Do what you like with the child, immobilize him, automatize him, dehumanize him, but save, save the minutes." In many ways the minutes are saved. By giving the child ready-made thoughts, the minutes required in thinking are saved. By giving the child ready-made definitions, the minutes required in formulating them are saved. Everything is prohibited that is of no measurable advantage to the child, such as the movement of the head or a limb, when there is no logical reason why it should be moved at the time. I asked the principal whether the children were not allowed to move their heads. She answered, "Why should they look behind when the teacher is in front of them?"—words too logical to be refuted.

During the recitations many minutes are saved. The principal has indeed solved the problem of how the greatest number of answers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be given in the smallest number of minutes. In the first place, no time is spent in selecting certain pupils to answer certain questions, every recitation being started by the first pupil in the class, the children then answering in turn, until all have recited. Secondly, time is economized in the act of rising and sitting during the recitations, the children being so drilled that the child who recites begins to fall back into his seat while uttering the last word of a definition, the next succeeding child beginning his ascent while the one before him is in the act of descending. Indeed, things appear as if the two children occupying adjoining seats were sitting upon the opposite poles of an invisible see-saw, so that the descending child necessarily raises the pupil next to him to his feet. Then again the minutes are saved by compelling the children to unload their answers as rapidly as possible, distinctness of utterance being sacrificed to speed, and to scream their answers at the tops of their voices, so that no time may be wasted in repeating words inaudibly uttered. For example, the principal's definition of a note—"A note is a sign representing to the eye the length or duration of time"—is ideally delivered, when it sounds something like "Notsinrepti length d'ration time."

Another way in which time is saved is by compelling the children to stare fixedly at the source whence the wisdom flows. When the teacher is the source of wisdom, all the children in the room stare fixedly in the direction of the teacher; when a word on the black-board is the source of wisdom, all eyes stare fixedly at a point on the black-board. There is one more peculiarity. When material, of whatever nature, is handed to the children, enough to supply a whole row is given to the end child. The material is then passed along sideways until each child in the row has been supplied. During this procedure the children are compelled to look straight in front of them, and to place their hands sidewise in order to receive the material, without looking whence it comes. The pupils are thus obliged to grope, as if they were blind, for the things passed to them. The principal assured me, however, that to drill the children in this groping is not attended with much difficulty, the pupils in the lowest primary grade—the little five-year-olds—learning to take and pass things like blind people during the first week or two of their school life.

Sense-training is a special feature of the school, and at least a half-dozen different methods, nearly all of which are original, are used for the purpose. The first of these methods is one by means of which form and color are studied in combination. I witnessed such a lesson in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the lowest primary grade. Before the lesson began there was passed to each child a little flag, upon which had been pasted various forms and colors, such as a square piece of green paper, a triangular piece of red paper, etc. When each child had been supplied, a signal was given by the teacher. Upon receiving the signal, the first child sprang up, gave the name of the geometrical form upon his flag, loudly and rapidly defined the form, mentioned the name of the color, and fell back into his seat to make way for the second child, thus: "A square; a square has four equal sides and four corners; green" (down). Second child (up): "A triangle; a triangle has three sides and three corners; red" (down). Third child (up): "A trapezium; a trapezium has four sides, none of which are parallel, and four corners; yellow" (down). Fourth child (up): "A rhomb; a rhomb has four sides, two sharp corners and two blunt corners; blue." This process continued until each child in the class had recited. The rate of speed maintained during the recitation was so great that seventy children passed through the process of defining in a very few minutes. The children are drilled in these definitions as soon as they enter the school, and the definitions are repeated from week to week and from year to year, until the child has finished his primary-school education.

In one of the higher classes I saw a modification of this procedure. Here each child was given a wooden geometrical form, and when the starting signal was given, instead of one child bobbing up and facing the teacher, two children sprang up, geometrical forms in hand, and faced each other. Then the following conversation ensued:

The second child asked the first child: "What have you in your hand?"

First child: "I have an oblong."

Second child: "Why do you say it is an oblong?"

First child: "Because it has two long sides, two short sides, and four corners."

When this answer had been rapidly screamed, a rather complicated triple motion, which was accomplished almost instantaneously, ensued. At one and the same time the first child sat down, the second child wheeled around, and the third rose to his feet and turned so as to face the second pupil. By the time the first pupil had fallen into his seat, the second and third pupils were already facing each other, and the third child was asking the second child, "What have you in your hand?"

Second child: "I have a square."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Third child: "Why do you say it is a square?"

Second child: "Because it has four equal sides and four corners."

When this had been said the triple motion again took place, so that in the twinkling of an eye the third and fourth pupils were already staring each other in the face and beginning to talk. This process was also continued until each child in the class had recited.

In the third lesson in form the teacher played the "star" part. This lesson was carried on as follows: The automatized teacher stood before the black-board and began the exercise by drawing upon the board, with a rapid stroke, a straight line. When this stroke had been made the following words were spoken:

Teacher: "What is this?"

First pupil: "It is a line."

Teacher: "What kind of a line?"

Second pupil: "It is a straight line."

The teacher now drew a crooked line upon the black-board and asked: "What is this?"

Third pupil: "It is a crooked line."

Teacher (to third pupil): "Wrong." (To fourth pupil): "Why don't you get up when the child before you makes a mistake?"

Fourth pupil: "It is a line."

Teacher: "What kind of a line?"

Fifth pupil: "It is a crooked line."

The teacher here said to me that the third child was a new pupil, who hadn't yet learned the methods of the school; but she assured me that the new pupils come round all right in a few days.

The reason why the third pupil's answer was considered wrong was not because it was wrong, but because each stroke of the chalk was intended to bring forth two questions and two answers, so that when the first question was answered in such a manner as to leave no occasion to ask the second question, the charm was broken and the answer could not be accepted.

In one of the rooms I saw a lesson in paper-folding which was so mechanical that a perfectly rhythmical motion was maintained throughout and the children appeared to have been wound up for the occasion. A lesson in arithmetic that I attended was fully as machine-like as the other exercises. The children ran through rows of figures just as they had run through definitions. When they were told to add the twos, the first pupil rose to his feet and cried, "Two"; the second child rose and said, "Four"; the third child rose and said, "Six," etc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The expressions in this exercise being so short, no child remained during any perceptible period upon his feet; so that the recitation consisted mainly of a bobbing up and down, and the class presented rather the appearance of a travelling pump-handle than of a large number of human beings.

Even a good part of a lesson in music is devoted to drilling the children in definitions. I heard the pupils in one of the classes give at least twenty-five music-definitions. In penmanship, the pupils learn by heart any number of principles of writing, none of which is known to most of those who earn their livelihood with the pen.

In reading, the word-method is followed, and the pupils are taught to read the number of words prescribed for the grade and no more, and they are taught to spell the words as they learn to read them. They are not encouraged to acquire the ability to read new words, each new word being developed before it is shown to the child, which means practically that the child is told what the word is before he is allowed to name it. But this method is typical of the New York primary schools. I asked the principal whether the children in the highest grade were not able to read new words without being told what they were. She answered in substance: "How can they know what a word is when they have never seen it before? Could you recognize a thing that you had never before seen?"

In no single exercise is a child permitted to think. He is told just what to say, and he is drilled not only in what to say, but also in the manner in which he must say it. There is no doubt that the principal succeeds to the letter in putting the children through the work of the grade, and the superintendents therefore see no reason why they should not criticise her most favorably.

The typical New York City primary school, although less barbarous and absurd than the one just described, is nevertheless a hard, unsympathetic, mechanical drudgery school, a school into which the light of science has not yet entered. Its characteristic feature lies in the severity of its discipline, a discipline of enforced silence, immobility, and mental passivity. The difference found in going from room to room and from school to school—I have seen many of them—is a difference in degree only and not in kind. One teacher will allow her pupils to move their heads a little more freely than the standard, another will allow a little more freedom to the shoulder-joints, but less freedom in moving the head, and the third requires the children to keep their hands in their laps, instead of behind their backs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The character of the instruction is identical with that found wherever this false system of discipline prevails, being of that form which appeals to the memory alone. The aim of the teacher is simply to secure results by drilling the pupils in the facts prescribed for the grade. The public-school system of New York City affords, therefore, another example of how, under unwise management, a trained teacher may be reduced to the level of one who has had no training. Many a New York school-teacher has told me that the New York school gives her no opportunity to put her knowledge of psychology and pedagogy to practical use, and that soon after beginning to teach she felt the normal-school influence vanish.

As the methods are unscientific, little can be gained by dilating upon them. Reading is taught by the combined word and spelling method; that is, the child is taught to recognize a word at sight and to spell the word as soon as he is able to read it. Each new word is taught by the above-mentioned development method. As has been said, to develop a word before the child is allowed to read it means practically to tell the child the name of the new word. For example, if the teacher desires to develop the word "boat," she will say in substance: "The other day I went down to the river and I saw something with a whole lot of people on it floating on the water." She then writes the word boat upon the black-board and asks the pupils, "What do you think this word is?" One child will say, "Ship"; another will say, "Steamer"; and a third will say, "Boat." In this manner the word "boat" is developed. Many teachers really believe that when the child thus reads the word "boat" he has succeeded in finding it out by himself. The word "dog" is developed by telling the children that it is something that says "bow-wow," and the word "cow" by informing them that it is an animal with horns and says "moo."

By the use of this method the child is actually prevented from exercising his reasoning faculties, and reading is converted into a pure and simple process of memorizing word forms. The results of the exclusive use of the combined word and spelling method I have always found to be very inferior. In New York City the primary reading is so poor that the children are scarcely able to recognize new words at sight at the end of the second school year. Even the third-year reading is miserable. In many cities the children read better at the end of the second year than they do in New York at the end of the third. Indeed, I feel as if I could truthfully say

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that in Minneapolis the pupils read as well at the end of the first year as they do in New York at the end of the third, and this in spite of the fact that the Minneapolis schools are charming and the pupils—even those from the poorest of homes—governed by love and sympathy. In these schools many methods—the word method, the sentence method, phonics, word-building, etc.—are used in teaching reading.

In the lowest grade of many of the New York primary schools the reading is exceptionally dry. I visited such a grade and found seventy-five words written upon a portion of the black-board. I learned that these seventy-five words were those that the pupils had been taught to read prior to the time of my visit, that each had been written upon the board as it was learned and retained there, and that the children were drilled daily both in reading and in spelling these words. I asked the principal, who had accompanied me to the class-room, whether the children never read sentences. I was informed that the teacher occasionally formed sentences by pointing with her stick to various words among the seventy-five. Of course, sentences so read in no way retain the spirit of letting the child read a sentence because it is the unit of thought. There is indeed no difference between reading sentences by pointing to isolated words and the mechanical reading of isolated words.

I next asked the principal how the seventy-five words on the board had been selected. She told me that they were words found in the reading-book that the children would receive in the next higher grade. She said, further, that she selected from one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and fifty words to be learned in this manner in the lowest grade, so that when the children took up the reading-book in the next class they should be able to read some of the words contained in it. In the lowest grade, therefore, the children are not supposed to read thoughtfully, but simply to memorize a large number of word forms. Can instruction be made less scientific?

In the same class I heard the children spell some of the words. When the spelling-lesson was announced, a number of children rose to their feet and turned their backs to the board, so that they might not be able to look at the words that they were asked to spell.

Throughout the primary grades arithmetic is taught fully as unscientifically as the reading. It is mechanical and abstract from the very beginning. In the class of which I have just been speaking, I heard the pupils add a column of "ones" and "twos" that had been written upon the black-board. The children added thus: "One and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one are two"; "two and two are four"; "four and one are five," and so on.

I now asked the principal whether arithmetic was ever taught by a concrete method.

"They will have concrete arithmetic work when they are a little further along in their reading," she replied.

"Will you kindly inform me what connection there is between reading and concrete arithmetic?" I asked.

"You see," she answered, "when the children can read the word 'oranges' or 'apples,' the teacher writes the word 'oranges' or 'apples' at the top of the column of figures, and then the pupils, instead of saying, 'One and two are three,' 'three and two are five,' will say, 'One orange and two oranges are three oranges,' and 'three oranges and two oranges are five oranges.' In that way the work in arithmetic is made concrete."

Space will not permit me to cite further instances showing that the methods followed in the New York primary schools are unscientific. But before beginning the discussion of the general management of the schools, I beg to repeat that the work described as typical may be found in all but very exceptional schools, the differences shown, not only in the discipline, but also in the methods, being differences in degree and not in kind. I have visited many of the New York primary schools, but have not yet found any exceptional ones.

It is not difficult to account for the low standard of the New York schools; indeed, under existing conditions, it would be surprising if the instruction were of a higher order. In the first place, there is absolutely no incentive to teach well. If mechanical teaching be in general deemed satisfactory, why should the teacher trouble with the preparation of lessons and the study of educational methods and principles, and then teach upon scientific principles at the risk of not covering the work of the grade? Further, a teacher scarcely imperils her position by doing exceedingly poor work, the only penalty being that an incompetent teacher cannot claim the maximum salary after she has taught the required fourteen years. In New York City teachers are very rarely discharged, even for the grossest negligence and incompetency. In order that a principal may be discharged, sixteen of the twenty-one members of the Board of Education must vote against her, and for many reasons it is practically impossible to secure that number of adverse votes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To discharge a teacher is also a matter attended with considerable difficulty. Before a teacher can be removed, a number of barriers must be passed. The majority of the members of the Board of Trustees of any ward can order the removal of a teacher in the ward, but before she can be removed the consent of the majority of the inspectors of the district must be obtained in writing. But even after the consent of three trustees out of five and two inspectors out of three has been obtained—it is not easy to obtain—the teacher has the right to appeal to the Board of Education, this body having the power to reverse the decisions of the trustees and inspectors and to order her reinstatement.

Secondly, there is no source of inspiration. As far as the supervising officers are concerned, practically nothing is done to raise the standard of the teachers. Indeed, the supervision as now conducted is little more than a farce. The Superintendent of Schools is simply an executive officer, who exerts no pedagogical influence upon the schools. What he does, beyond meeting the assistant-superintendents once a month and the principals three or four times annually, and keeping certain sets of books, is a question that no one as yet appears to have answered.

Besides the chief officer, eight assistant-superintendents are employed to supervise the work of four thousand teachers. Though some of them possess expert qualifications and the ability to educate teachers, the circumstances under which they labor appear to be such as to render their services of very little value. Even under the most favorable circumstances, a single supervising officer cannot successfully direct the work of five hundred teachers. But, in addition, the method of supervision—if indeed there be a method—is so unsystematic as apparently to render their services of least value. Each classroom in the city is supposed to be visited and examined by one or more supervisors once a year.[1] But there are no district lines, and the visits are consequently very irregularly arranged. Further, the visits are too few to be of real benefit to the teacher, and yet frequent enough to disturb the teacher's mental equilibrium during the intervening period. Under the circumstances, it were better for all concerned if there were no supervision at all, and this is doubly true for the reason that whether or not the supervisors find the teachers competent is a matter of very little practical consequence. Besides examining classes,

[1] Teachers with good records are exempt from regular supervision; the poorer teachers receive extra visits.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the assistant-superintendents lecture from time to time. Each teacher attends in all three or four such lectures annually.

The argument is used that the duty of instructing the teachers does not devolve upon the supervisors, but upon the principals. The principals of the New York schools do not teach, and it is believed that their time should be devoted to the training of their teachers. But when we consider that in selecting principals expert qualifications are not taken into account, the argument becomes worthless. Indeed, as a rule, the newly-appointed teachers are better qualified professionally than the principals. While the new teachers are normal-school graduates, many of the principals have had no professional training whatever, nor have they at any time, either with or without guidance, devoted a sufficient amount of time to professional studies to learn the A, B, C of scientific pedagogy. Some principals read enough educational matter to pick up a few devices, but those who may be said to be experts are very rare exceptions. In the grammar departments quite a number of principals may be found who are alive and active, and who exert an excellent influence upon their teachers, and of their own free will have developed very good schools. But the same can hardly be said of the primary principals. The typical primary principal does not know that education means anything beyond cramming into the minds of the pupils a certain number of cut-and-dried facts. What the average principal does beyond keeping an accurate account of the attendance of pupils and teachers and listening to complaints from parents and teachers, is also a matter that has puzzled more than one intimately acquainted with the New York public schools.

Now, a word concerning those who are responsible for the condition of the schools—the members of the various Boards of Education. The Board of Education, properly speaking, consists of three independent bodies. The first of these is the central Board, known as the Board of Education. It consists of twenty-one members, who are appointed by the Mayor. Secondly, there are eight Boards of Inspectors, each of which has three members, who exercise a sort of supervision over the schools of three wards. Inspectors also are appointed by the Mayor. Thirdly, there are twenty-four Boards of Trustees—one for each ward—each of which has five members. The Trustees are appointed by the Board of Education. There are, therefore, in all, one hundred and sixty-five persons directly connected with the management of the schools.

Things appear to be arranged among these bodies upon the princi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ple of power without responsibility. When anything goes amiss, it is impossible to discover which one of these one hundred and sixty-five persons is responsible. "No one is responsible for anything" has become a by-word among those who in any way seek to fix responsibility. In many of the schools a most horribly unsanitary condition of affairs prevails, for which no one is in any way responsible. The course of studies is highly unscientific, but no one constructed it and no one is responsible for it. When appointments are to be made, every one is on the alert; when responsibility is to be fixed, no one is in readiness to step forward. Everything appears to be involved in a most intricate muddle.

The power to appoint the teachers is vested in the Board of Trustees, while the appointment of superintendents and principals lies in the hands of the Board of Education. In no way has any one connected with the educational side of the system a word to say concerning the appointment or discharge of principals or teachers. Nearly all appointments are made by "pulls," merit being a side issue. The superintendents should naturally be held responsible for poor teaching, but justly they cannot be so held, for the reason that it is almost impossible for them to have incompetents discharged. Indeed, the superintendent has said that he has given up, as a hopeless task, attempting to have incompetent principals and teachers discharged. Therefore the supervisors can justly lay the blame of poor teaching upon the members of the Board of Education, while the Board of Education can justly throw this responsibility upon the shoulders of those whose duty it is to secure proper teaching. So things have always been and so they will remain until a radical change is effected. Meanwhile, none suffer but those for whom the millions are appropriated—the children.

In regard to the public, the mere fact that things are muddled as they are proves that the citizens take no active interest in the schools. As for the parents in particular, the fact that they send their children to unsanitary schools—indeed, so unsanitary as to be unfit for the habitation of human beings—is of itself sufficient to prove that they are in no way concerned with what the schools do with their children. This is true not only of the more ignorant classes, some of the most unhealthful schools in the city being attended by children from the best of homes.

Now, how may the evils be eradicated and the schools improved? That the schools of small cities may be improved in a comparatively

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

small time is a matter that has been repeatedly demonstrated; but how to improve the schools of large cities is a problem that has never been solved. The large cities should therefore learn the lesson taught by the small ones, namely, that if the superintendent is an educator and spares no pains in endeavoring to improve the minds of his teachers, a few years will suffice to raise the standard of the schools, *provided the number of teachers in his charge be not too large.*

This principle might be applied to a large city by treating it as a collection of small ones. A superintendent cannot well care for more than one hundred and fifty, or at most two hundred, teachers; in other words, he cannot properly care, without assistance, for a city of more than seventy-five thousand inhabitants at the utmost. As New York City has twenty times two hundred teachers, twenty times seventy-five thousand inhabitants, its schools should be divided into at least twenty independent districts, each one of which should be placed in charge of a superintendent having all the powers and responsibilities of a city-superintendent. In the appointment of special supervisors, such as supervisors of drawing, music, etc., these district lines should be strictly observed, so that each district-superintendent might be held responsible in every way for the schools of his district. The district-superintendent should be required to devote all his working hours to visiting classes for the purpose of aiding the teachers and to meeting teachers in order to instruct them in methods and educational principles as well as in their grade work.

Under an arrangement of this nature, provided the right sort of superintendents be secured, there is no reason why the schools of each district should not improve as rapidly as the schools of a small city, when in good hands. Though each district would in great part be independent, it should nevertheless be regarded as but a part of a large system. Unity can and must be preserved. How, under these conditions, it may be preserved, I shall now endeavor to show.

In the first place, there should then, as now, be a city-superintendent responsible for the general condition of the schools throughout the city. The city-superintendent should take an active part in improving the minds of the teachers. All his time should be devoted to visiting classes and to teaching teachers. One day in each month might be spent by him in one of the districts, and this would enable him to make his rounds once a month. Three or four hours might readily be spent daily by the city-superintendent in visiting classes, and the hours from four to six in the afternoon in meeting the teachers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He might meet the two hundred teachers of a district in a body for the purpose of conducting an educational conference. This would enable him to meet all his four thousand teachers once a month. Three or four hours devoted to visiting the schools of each district once a month would be sufficient to enable the superintendent to judge how things in any particular district are progressing. Such visits should be suggestive and not examinational. The city-superintendent should be in every sense an educator, and as such he would seek unity rather than uniformity, and he would give each district-superintendent liberty to develop his pedagogical powers, but would check that which partakes of the nature of license. The superintendent, principals, and teachers of each district would now be likely to do their utmost to develop the best schools in the city, and a healthful competitive spirit might readily be maintained. In four or five years marked differences in regard to the degree of excellence of the schools of individual districts would appear. The schools of the incompetent and non-energetic superintendents would be likely to fall so far behind the best that such officers could not well retain their positions, and a natural weeding out of incompetent persons would ensue.

Secondly, a board of superintendents, of which each district-superintendent should be a member and the city-superintendent the presiding officer, should be formed. This board should meet frequently for educational discussions, and all important matters concerning the pedagogical management of the schools should be brought before it. The course of studies should result from the conferences of this board. Above all, the power to appoint principals and teachers should be vested in this board of superintendents. As each district-superintendent would be held responsible for the condition of the schools of his district, his wishes concerning the persons to be appointed should be respected; he should be allowed to nominate the teachers, but the board of superintendents should confirm the nominations and retain a veto power. Under these conditions appointments would be made for merit alone, and each district-superintendent would certainly do his utmost to find proper persons to fill vacancies. The power to discharge teachers and principals should be vested in the board of superintendents. The city-superintendent should be appointed by the Board of Education, but as he would be held responsible for the schools of all the districts, he should have the power to nominate his assistants, and not more than a veto power should be vested in the Board of Education.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The financial management of the schools might remain undisturbed in the hands of the various boards as now existing, but all matters pertaining to the educational part of the system—the formulation of the course of studies, the appointment and discharge of principals and teachers—should be in the hands of the board of experts.

The additional expense that would be incurred under this plan would be, comparatively speaking, only nominal. An allowance of four thousand dollars for a district-superintendent and ten thousand dollars to each district for special supervisors would require an additional expenditure of less than two hundred thousand dollars a year, an increase of only five per cent over that now incurred by the maintenance of the corps of teachers.

J. M. RICE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WEALTH AND BUSINESS RELATIONS OF THE WEST.

WHERE is the West? In popular estimation the West in this country seems to be an indefinite area between the Pacific Ocean and the standpoint of the observer, wherever that may be. In the matter of wealth, however, it may better be described as all that part of our country not in the vicinity of New York. At the very least it is not less than all that part of our country west of a line drawn from the city of Washington to the city of Chicago. This means that Florida, Ohio, and Wisconsin are in the West, as truly as Kansas and California. It also means that the States named and the States they represent have interests in common to a far greater extent than they usually seem to realize.

What wealth has the West and what part of it is hers? There is scarcely danger of disagreement as to the nature of wealth. Primarily it is that which will insure to man what he wants. Land is wealth, and houses for shelter, and building materials, and machinery, and mines, and cattle, and fisheries, and all else which will support life and protect and embellish it. The contrivances of society for the designation of wealth must not be confused with wealth itself. The railway track and the locomotive are primary wealth; a bond or a share of stock of the railway company is merely evidence of the holder's ownership of a part of the track and the locomotive.

The West possesses nearly all the primary wealth of the country. The East is not by nature an especially bountiful mother. She is inhospitable, even hostile. The sufferings of the first settlers of the East in New England would never have been much modified, at least for large populations, but for help from the Western provinces. Massachusetts is said to produce less than one-five-hundredth of what she consumes. If New York be rightly called the Empire State, what name shall be applied to such States as Missouri, Montana, Kansas, Colorado, Texas, and California? If Broadway property is worth a fortune a foot, it is merely, for the most part, because the business of the West is by arbitrary selection done there. I repeat, therefore, the West has nearly all the primary wealth of the country. It has, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

example, nearly ninety-five per cent of the total tillable acreage. It has on these acres forty million people, who are in possession of forty billion dollars' worth of property, including more than one hundred and fifty-two million farm animals, worth over two billion and seventy million dollars; and more than one hundred and forty thousand miles of railway, worth over eight billion dollars. How to express the value of fine climate, curative waters, and magnificent scenery in words and figures I leave to some volunteer from Tennessee, Minnesota, Kansas, Colorado, or California, with the skill of long practice. Our census is not authority on such branches. What wealth the West has and what part of it she owns are widely different matters. It is, of course, impossible to measure accurately the Eastern share of Western wealth. It is in two forms. The first is the form of security for debt; the second is the form of title in fee. The West owes at least six hundred million dollars of State, county, municipal, and township debt, the total of such debt in the country being (in 1890) $1,135,210,442. The West owes its proportion of the $891,960,104 of national debt. The private debt of the West is enormous. All this debt is practically owned in the East (including Europe), and the annual interest goes where the debt is owned.

As to Western property legally owned in the East, the amount is incalculable. The railway property is a good item to begin with. Then comes the telegraph; then come the mines; then come bank, mercantile, and manufacturing properties; then come all sorts of ordinary holdings, such as lands, buildings, cattle and other chattels. Probably the only strictly accurate statement that can be made is to say that the East owns a gigantic share of the West. It surely does. What has caused the present peculiar distribution of the ownership of Western wealth? The location of primary wealth by no means determines the location of its ownership. The modern machinery of civilization makes it easy for proprietors and their property to be and remain far apart. Riches take wings in more ways than one, and net profits are migratory. Accumulated dollars are like birds of a feather. Close communion is in the creed of rich men. This latter is not so much because they love each other as because they love the same things. Proximity also enables them to watch each other. And so it happens that while the West has produced and now possesses great wealth, the East owns perhaps the greater portion of it. To tell how this came about is partly to excuse and partly to condemn Western people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What I have described as the financial West has been at a disadvantage, because it is all a new country, a young country, except the southeastern portion of it, and when the effect of the war is considered, that part is even newer and younger than the central portion. The inhabitants of this financial West are almost wholly immigrants from the East. They, or their immediate ancestors, emigrated from their homes in nearly all cases by reason of financial distress. The older new settlers came without money and left debts behind to be paid and obligations in the way of friends to be partly or wholly supported. The younger new settlers came without money and left at least friendly obligations behind, if not debts. These new dwellers in an old wilderness were largely hopeful, industrious, intelligent, and courageous; and just these admirable qualities made them eager to enjoy and therefore swift to borrow. A great anxiety for present possession and a great confidence in future development, together with rank financial carelessness in certain general localities and in spots everywhere, caused the credit of the West to be strained early near to its breaking limit.

Much of the debt thus created was wise and proper, such as the debt for educational purposes. Much of it, on the other hand, was unwise, such as parts of the railroad-aid debt. But, wise or unwise, it has had to be paid and will have to be paid, more or less duly, with interest and penalties. If a dollar of money had been invested in the West for every dollar of debt acknowledged by it, there would be far less grief than is now felt. The Western people can only plead ignorance or carelessness, or both, in explanation of why they gave away gratuitously so many promises to pay gold dollars. From the list of the guilty for this should be carefully deducted those who in the actual distress of frontier life have been forced to give more than they received that they might secure relief from immediate suffering.

The West has been at a disadvantage, because it has been in violent competition with itself. Every acre of Kansas land has been in competition with every acre of Illinois land, just as both the Kansas and Illinois land has been in competition with New York and New England land. The abandoned farms of Vermont and New Hampshire are abandoned for the same reason that the unoccupied lands of the West are unoccupied: the competition of vast areas of better land has made their profitable operation impossible.

Just as the lumber business of Pennsylvania was revolutionized by the opening of the great lumber regions of the central North and South, so the agricultural business in all its branches has been several

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

times revolutionized by the oceans of new land from time to time flooding the market. Farms in Ohio and Indiana which have been profitable in the past and will be again are now undesirable. The opening of one single irrigating ditch in Colorado added to the agricultural land of the country an area as large as the State of Connecticut; the building of a single Western railroad brought comparatively near market more good land than there is in all New York and New England. Thus millions of acres of agricultural and mineral lands have conspired to break down the prices of agricultural and mineral products. The sanguine settlers of the West were right in their estimate of the capabilities of their new country, but wrong in their assumption that the capacity of the markets would remain equal to the supply.

The West has been at a disadvantage because it has, necessarily or not, bought all its manufactured articles in the East. The absolute degree to which the West has been subjected to the East in the matter of manufactures is rarely understood. The canned corn and tomatoes, for example, used in Kansas and Nebraska and beyond come chiefly from Baltimore. Boston baked beans all the way from Boston are sold at every well-regulated lunch counter in the West. Until recent years the flour from Rochester, New York, held first place in all Western markets; and Pittsburg nails have, at least until lately, been carried beyond the Pueblo steel mills into the heart of one of the greatest iron areas in the world to the exclusion of the Pueblo product. Raw cotton goes—nobody knows where it does not go—to be manufactured, anywhere and everywhere away from its native place, no matter how much coal and timber may be near it or how close it may be to the sea.

In every line the West has gone far to get much—from pins and matches to clothing, food, and machinery. In fact, it is hard to think what manufactured articles do not come from the East. The Western manufactures spoken of in census reports are in some part secondary manufactures, such as the repairing of machinery, rather than its original manufacture. The fact that Western manufactures are steadily increasing does not change the fact that in the past there have been practically none. To diminish the net value of a Western product by hauling it East, and to increase the cost of an Eastern manufactured article by hauling it West, has been a whipsaw process which has steadily ravaged the Western pocket-book, and many times even the pocket-book of the common carrier that has participated in the hauling.

The West has been at a disadvantage because all the profits of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

transportation between the East and the West have gone East to remain. The railroads, all considered, have probably not made unreasonable profits, but whatever they have made has been an Eastern gain. If the West owned the roads, such profit as there is in the transportation business would, of course, remain in the West. As it now is, the East is almost alone in the business and enjoys a corresponding advantage. What is true of railroads in this respect is also true of telegraph and express lines. Moreover, the inventive spirit of the age has constantly furnished the East new resources which compete with Western resources. The ocean can now feed the people of the Atlantic States to an extent that it once could not. When a Baltimorean admits, as one recently did, that he can get good, fresh oysters and fish (from the Atlantic) in Kansas at a low price, it is fair to assume that the East gets them at a lower price, and that all such supplies used in the West are used in place of some Western product. New methods of culture, manufacture, and transportation have greatly changed the conditions in the food markets of the nation in the past few years.

The West has been at a disadvantage by reason of the inferior skill of its average agricultural and industrial workers. All over the southern West, as the natural result of *ante-bellum* methods, there has been a scarcity of genuine thrift—the thrift that has made France rich, to say nothing of England and New England—while the central and the ultramontane West have suffered from a very general feverish, speculative, restless, move-to-the-next-cheap-land-or-boom-town sort of a feeling which has been productive of bad farming, bad contriving, and reckless living generally. Wherever the plough spends the winter at the end of the last furrow, and wherever the fences do not command the respect of marauding cows, there men decay and wealth does not accumulate. The man of thrift gets many times as much service from his tin cup, his cook-stove, his harness, and his mule as the man of careless habits. The West needs to exchange an army of slovenly apprentices for as many well-trained journeymen. The exchange will be made in time.

The West has spent its money in the East for insurance, at a fabulous profit to the East. For example, over one hundred companies are elaborately represented in Kansas alone. What is true of insurance to our disadvantage is true of education. Thousands of young men and women annually go East to study—many of them going where they get less for their money than they would nearer home. The machinery of the churches makes a drain from West to East for for-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eign missionary and other purposes, though in early days the Eastern churches sent a great volume of money West. Nearly every dollar spent in the West for entertainments, dramatic and otherwise, has gone East—is steadily going East. Practically all the money spent in the West for books and periodicals and pictures goes East. The West is relatively a far better market for literature than the East, because it is building up its libraries from the foundation, and its isolation, together with the Eastern interests of Western settlers, makes periodical literature in especial demand. Almost every pretentious book—even when "published" in Chicago—is manufactured in the East. Even the country paper in New Mexico or Idaho is half-printed on plates edited and made in the East and sent West by express. For medical and surgical skill the West goes to the East always when it can, though not always wisely or necessarily. The location of the national capital means constant and voluminous contributions from the West to the East. The annual flight of Western people to the Northeast to escape warm weather means an immeasurable sum of money going from West to East, for there is practically no reciprocal flight. The Florida and Southern California winter travel and the Rocky Mountain summer travel do not begin to equal the summer travel to the Northeast. Europe gets vast sums of money from Western tourists, who are rarely economical when they get among oriental attractions. Royalties on patented inventions go East, for that is where the rights are owned, no matter where the inventing may have been done.

When Western men have left money to educational and charitable objects, it has been true in the past that nearly always the objects of their generosity have been in the East. Within three months two bequests in Kansas City, amounting to nearly seventy-five thousand dollars, have been left to an Eastern school and an Eastern church organization. Cornell College, the pride of New York, is endowed in large part with money derived from the sale of Western lands which it obtained for practically nothing. Think of the public domain in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, and other States devoted to the support of a university in New York. The transaction, of course, was legitimate, and Cornell is to be commended and congratulated; but the fact remains that the nation made a mistake at the expense of the West. Under the same law all the Eastern States, in proportion to their respective populations, were given a like share of the Western domain for like purposes.

The West has suffered from its own internal public necessities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has been forced to build its public institutions quickly, where the East has had centuries of time. Kansas, for example, in thirty years has secured and nearly paid for a capitol, two insane asylums, a penitentiary, a reformatory, two reform schools, a university, a normal school, an agricultural college, an imbecile school, an institution for the blind, another for the deaf and dumb, a soldiers' home—in all some fifty or sixty buildings of modern style and great value, with appropriate grounds. What Kansas has done other States have done in varying degrees of generosity. The West has had to contend with the fact that a large number of its people have never considered it home or have removed from it after making fortunes in it. From the Chinamen on the Pacific coast to such men as Mr. C. P. Huntington, Mr. Austin Corbin, and the Messrs. Rockefeller, there have been widely divergent classes of people who have sent their money or themselves, or both, out of the West with the least possible delay. Thus the West has not come into the advantageous relations with resident capitalists which might have been expected, and which would have reduced interest charges and increased manufactures.

The West has been injured by the slow but sure rise in the value of gold. It has had to pay in gold as promised, and has suffered therefrom precisely as if it had promised to pay in bushels and the bushel had been steadily increased in size. But this change has not been of a hundredth part the importance assigned it by the misleaders of the people, as it has been exceedingly slow and slight and has helped as well as hindered almost every individual. Many securities calling for gold are not paid in gold, as the holders, when ready to sell, take that currency which can be had quickest. The whole money history of the country probably leans a little against the West, but it has been and is one of the least of her adversaries—in spite of the roar of the candidate to the contrary.

And thus might be enumerated a thousand methods by which Western money has been drawn East and Eastern ownership in the West many times multiplied. The offset to this outflow of money is confined almost entirely to what is paid the West for raw material. For corn, cotton, cattle, wheat, fruit, and other such products a large sum is paid yearly, but it is paid chiefly in the nature of a credit, there being always a large balance in favor of the East. The West gets some pension-money, but it first supplies most of the money with which this payment is made. It gets also now and then a liberal gift like that from the late William B. Spooner, of Boston, of one hundred

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thousand dollars to Oberlin College, Ohio, and a like sum to the University of Kansas. It also gets something by the acquisition of new settlers of wealth who leave the East in search of advantageous climates or for other personal reasons. But, in the main, the West gets only such money from the East as its staple products bring.

What should the West do to protect itself? At least a partial answer to this important question may easily be given. In the first place, the West should secure to itself all the advantage of having first-class credit. It should pay all its debts with rigid honesty, and thereby get command of such money as it must borrow at the lowest possible rates. Every instance of repudiation, partial or complete, raises interest rates for all in proximity and costs a thousand times what it saves. When the lowest possible interest rate has been secured, then money should be borrowed only in the most conservative manner, for the surest purposes. The time has come when railroads and similar improvements will be built wherever they are needed, without especial assistance in the way of bonded indebtedness or its equivalent. The short way of expressing it is to say that no money should be borrowed for speculation. This applies to the farmer who borrows to make small ventures out of the proper line of his business, as well as to the town, county, or State that borrows money to buy a railroad, the title to which it does not get, in the hope that it will enhance the value of real estate and increase business. Speculation is speculation no matter who indulges in it, and it is a game usually planned against the player.

Close to the matter of refraining from debt is that of withholding municipal franchises from gift to private persons or corporations. Every city should furnish its own water, gas, transportation, and light, either directly or by contract let to the highest bidder, or otherwise, so as to make sure of good service at reasonable expense. It is possible that in the past Western cities have received more than they have paid for by giving away their public-service rights, as thousands of stocks and bonds have been absorbed in the East which have proven heavy losses to their owners. But this has been due to the fluctuating nature of the new towns in the new West. Now that conditions have become generally permanent, the various municipalities can act with perfect safety in becoming their own public servants in the matter of water and light and transportation, as well as in the matter of sewers and police protection.

The West should do more of its own manufacturing. This should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

begin on the farm and in the home. Individuals should buy from abroad fewer things that they can contrive for themselves. The old-fashioned New England farm economies were in substance merely home manufactures. Out of them our ancestors grew rich. There has been a gratifying general increase in Western manufacturing in the past ten years, but only a start has been made on the right road. The West should do another thing which is related to home manufacturing. It should diversify its products. Regions which produce only corn, or cotton, or timber, or silver, or coal, or fish, usually wear the same badge—the badge of poverty. A farmer in western Kansas—in the middle of the western quarter of Kansas—said last October:

"I came to Kansas without a dollar. I have never made a dollar in Kansas except by farming. I went in debt for my first quarter section, to the extent of the purchase-price of ten dollars per acre. I now own a whole section clear of all debt, and have brought up my family decently. We have all worked hard, but not so hard really as town workmen. I have made money every year I have been farming in Kansas. How do I do it? By diversifying my crops. I have always hit on something for which there is a good market. One year it is watermelons, another alfalfa, another wheat. I have never failed to have at least one paying thing on my list."

This is an accurate report of an honest man's remarks in response to close questions. Diversification of products first fortifies a Western farmer by giving him at home the necessary circuit of subsistence, so that he need not sell his surplus at an unfortunate time merely that he may live. The plea for increased home manufactures in the West is also equivalent to a plea for selling off its surplus only in the most condensed form. It is better to ship corn in the ear than in the shock; in the kernel than in the ear; in pork and beef than in the kernel; in high-grade pork and beef than in low grade; in dressed pork and beef than in live. The nearer its ultimate form a product comes, the less, proportionately, is the charge for transportation and the less is subtracted from the source of production.

The West should cultivate assiduously all those characteristics which will excite the love and admiration of her own sons and daughters and the stranger within her gates. Men of independent means may live where they please. When such men move from west to east their bank accounts go with them. Beautiful towns, good roads, the best schools (from *kindergarten* to university), active churches, reasonable laws—all these agencies will save the West far more than they cost. Everything of beauty in the West will surely be a joy forever

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to some man who, without it, would go elsewhere and take his money with him. The best achievements of the architect, the builder, the artisan, and the artist should be encouraged without stint. The beautiful club-houses of Albuquerque, Helena, and Chattanooga will anchor more money there every year than the houses cost. The palaces of Portland and Pasadena, San Francisco, Denver, and St. Louis will always hold near them thousands besides their owners.

The West should keep her statute-books clear of all crude, extravagant, and extraordinary laws which accomplish nothing but the purposes of the demagogues and cranks who devise them, except to drive rich men to the seclusion of great cities and the immunity of non-residence. Nagging laws and gad-fly officials make a combination which draws poverty like a plaster. How to give the most attention and attract the least should be the design of every law—not to say law-maker. This must not be construed as a reflection on stringent liquor laws, or any other laws directly stimulating the virtues of the people; for no intelligent man can forget that vice occasions every nation many times more loss in any given time than all other causes combined.

The West should see that her political reforms, like charity, begin at home. There is not a town, county, or State government in the West that may not be better conducted than it now is for much less money than it now costs. Elaborate organizations for the government of small towns and sparsely-settled counties; payment of officers by large and unreported fees, instead of by fair salaries; slow and slovenly courts, half-paid but not worth half what they get; too frequent elections and too much legislation; too little restraint on the vicious and too little care for the unfortunate; cumbersome, careless, and corrupt management of cities, made possible by the neglect of citizens generally—all these matters, and such as these, are of far more consequence to the people than the ordinary affairs of the Federal Government. And, finally, if the West wishes to make sure of propitiating the gods, she should offer up her political demagogues as a burnt-offering.

In some sections of the United States the country has always been run by political leaders. In other sections the political leaders have been run by their country. The last is the correct method, and if the West would adopt it universally and at once send to the rear all her ambitious citizens who promise to cure in Congress ills that Congress cannot reach, a great relief would be realized. The real

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people of the People's party are right in their discovery that something is wrong, that there is a degree of "calamity" in the West; but they are wrong in believing what most of their leaders tell them as to the cause. These leaders claim that there is but one trouble and one remedy. They say the trouble is bad law and the remedy a change of office-holders. They teach that government is all in all. Like the one-drug doctors, they prescribe for all miseries their sole remedy. In season and out they continually cry for the blood of those in office. Occasionally, of course, it has been impossible for the People's party to effect a change for the worse in this line, as the worst has been already in; but as a rule, so far, the party has only sacrificed skilled and faithful public servants, passed by those who have been founders and builders of their respective States or communities, and chosen instead cheap men lacking even a primary comprehension of political truth or political wisdom. In no single case, by either the good, bad, or indifferent of these leaders, have I heard the real truth told—the truth such as is here set down. No intelligent man elected to office by the People's party in its brief career—no such man as Col. William A. Harris, Congressman-elect, from Kansas, or Governor-elect Lewelling, of Kansas—will dare to deny over his own signature the statement that the financial troubles of the West are due mainly, not to bad Federal statutes, but to the facts enumerated in this paper.

What concern has the East in all these facts? It has abundant reason to think of them most seriously. It is to its advantage to maintain the most cordial relations with the West. The West can get along without the East better than the East can without the West. The East can retain the affection of the West only by showing affection. Since the earliest years very little affection has appeared. In a business way the East has driven as hard bargains as she could. In a social way—or in what may be termed a social-political-business way—there has been on the part of the East as little affection as there has been much ignorance. The East has treated the West somewhat as England has treated the United States. "Out to America" and "Out West" have been similar phrases in similar use. Eastern people have too much neglected the ties that bind. They have felt no obligation to know their own country before knowing Europe. Mr. Depew, the brilliant president of the Vanderbilt railways, which depend on the West for a great part of their traffic, up to within two years ago had never been west of Chicago, and at this writing has, I believe, been no further west than Denver, which is only about four

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hundred miles west of the centre of the United States. When he mentioned the Chicago limit to his western travels he did not appear to be the least ashamed of it. Such relations to the West on the part of such men cannot but result in much inconsiderate and unwise action. If the East knew the West as it should, it would not now be true that the repositories of the East are crowded with idle money for which its owners know of no satisfactory investment. The ignorance about the West which prevails in the East characterizes even most of the newspapers. A long and careful study of the Eastern papers convinces me that, as a rule, they bear about the same relation to the West that the English newspapers do to the United States.

The East is rich and can wait for what it wants. It can wait for great advantages and great winnings and disregard the demands of conservative business. I need not quote a higher authority on this than the late Mr. Gould. An eminent ex-chief-justice of one of the Western States once put before him a business plan. Mr. Gould listened intently and interposed no discouraging remarks. When the lawyer had no more to say, Mr. Gould remarked briefly that he could not coöperate with him. "Which do you doubt, my words or my figures?" queried the astonished lawyer. "Neither," answered Mr. Gould. "On the contrary, I think you have outlined a most excellent conservative business scheme. But such things are not wanted in New York. If, instead of showing a certainty of making a fair interest on a large investment, you would show a probability of great profits on a small investment, you would have what will go here." The East can wait indefinitely, because she has only the distress of avarice, which at its worst rarely equals the distress of poverty. The East has come to its present condition by centuries of saving, industry, and thrift, and her possession is a power with which she may trifle whether she ought to or can afford to or not. Eastern financiers of real strength and character should do all in their power to discourage the fly-by-night financiers who flit about the West, treating the people to buncombe and bunco in about equal parts. The Eastern men who use the West as a base of operations for swindling their own Eastern neighbors, and then roll their eyes in horror at the wickedness of the West to which they charge all the blame, have their victims at both ends of the line and ought to receive double punishment. They are driving a wedge between the East and the West. A fatal wedge of this kind is not an unprecedented possibility. A glance at the map of Europe shows that people of the least geographical separation are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

often furthest apart. If the East had done all its duty by the old West—the South—there would have been no War of the Rebellion. England has her Irish question. Primarily it was her own fault. The East should work as well as pray to be delivered from such calamities. This country wants no problem like the Irish problem in England.

It is not my purpose to croak about the West or to scold the East. The West is getting along slowly but surely toward all sorts of supremacy, while the East has not been guilty of much more than forgetfulness. My object is merely to contribute to a perfect mutual understanding, to the end that all may prosper to the uttermost. It is probably impracticable to ask, still more to expect, the average business man in the East to do much more than to get what money he can every day as the days come. But the giants in business and in politics and in education can be expected to act with reference to the whole people rather than the few. If they do not, their descendants will wish they had.

CHARLES S. GLEED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LITERARY AND MUNICIPAL PROBLEMS IN ENGLAND.

As the throng which gathered to the funeral of our great poet melted slowly away from the Abbey, the same thought was borne in upon many of us—Have we then no poet left in England? The passing away of a great figure which for two generations has filled the mind and speech of men is always wont to leave this impression of a void. Forty years ago, when Wellington was laid beside Nelson in St. Paul's, Tennyson groaned out: "The last great Englishman is low." And as we left the Laureate alone with his peers in Poets' Corner, there rose to a hundred lips the murmur: "The last English poet is gone!" It was a natural feeling, an unthinking impulse; perhaps a blind mistake.

It is inevitable that we should seek at times like this to compare, to judge, to anticipate the verdict of our posterity. But the impulse should be resisted: it is futile and worse than useless. We are far too near to judge Tennyson truly or even to decide if he has left a successor. The permanent place of a poet depends on his one or two, three or four, grandest bursts, and his inferior work is forgotten. So too the poetry which startles and delights its immediate generation is almost always much weaker than the poetry which mellows like wine as generations succeed. It needed for Dante five entire centuries before his real greatness was admitted; it needed two centuries for Shakespeare.

It would be strange if English poetry were to close its glorious roll with the name of Tennyson. For three hundred years now our race has never failed to find a fine poet "to stand before the Lord." Shakespeare had done immortal things while Spenser still lived. Ben Jonson survived until the early lyrics of Milton. Dryden was in full career when "Paradise Lost" was published, and when Dryden died Pope was already "lisping in numbers." Pope survived till Gray was a poet and Cowper a youth; and with Burns, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Byron, and Shelley, the list comes down to the poet whom we have just buried. In these three centuries, from the "Faery Queen" until to-day, the only gap is for the ten years which separate the "Rape of the Lock" from the death of Dryden. But at Spenser's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

death, who really knew what Shakespeare was, and at that of Byron and Shelley, who thought of Tennyson as their successor?

They who were present at the burial in the Abbey had opened to them, as in a vision, some glimpse down into the depths of the poetry, the persistence, and solemnity of English life—into that deep undercurrent which flows far below our gross and common every-day life. What a flood of memories from ancient history, what a halo of heroism, art, and devotion, consecrate that spot! A church built in the age of the Crusades, with foundations and memorials, tombs and crypts, that go back to the Saxon kings, in the history of which Agincourt, the Civil Wars, the Reformation, and the Commonwealth are mere episodes, and wherein even three centuries of a long succession of poets form but the later chapters—such a building seems to hold the very heart of the English people. Statesmen, artists, churchmen, poets, men of science and men of business, all schools, creeds, and interests, came together; sect, party, and rivalry ceased to divide men—all were Englishmen come to do honor to their poet. There was no parade, no eloquence, nothing of unusual show; no trumpets, helmet, or plume, no "guard of honor" or officials in uniform or robes; there was no concourse of elaborate music or feats of epideictic oratory. It was the daily service of the Abbey choir, the ordinary burial, with no feature of it uncommon, except the flag upon the coffin. Not a word was spoken outside the Prayer-Book; nothing was done which is not done every day when honored men are buried. Merely this—that the vast cathedral and the square in which it stands were filled with silent and eager masses, that around the coffin were gathered men of every type of activity and thought which England holds, that the whole English-speaking race was represented and was deeply stirred.

In the whole world there is nothing left which in continuity and poetry of association can be put beside a burial in our Abbey. It is doubtful if anything recorded in history ever matched it altogether in the volume and beauty of its impressiveness, or ever before so mysteriously blended the sense of antiquity with the sense of life. For there is nothing artificial, nothing of mere antiquarianism, in the Englishman's love for the Abbey and its sacred dust. The common seaman in Nelson's fleets felt it; the American citizen feels it more intensely often than the Londoner; they feel it in their hearts at home in Africa and in Australasia; to the whole English-speaking people the associations of the Abbey are both profoundly historic and vividly modern. The Abbey suggests to us all three things in equal force:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Past, Poetry, Living Work. That is the true strength of England, which to the German is a metaphysical enigma and to the Frenchman seems an amazing paradox—that below our eternal money-grabbing and vulgar routine there is a sense among us that the Past and the Future are really one, and that we must be the link between the two. That makes the most material and most conventional of European nations at bottom the most capable of great poetry.

So let us not despair of one day finding a poet worthy to carry on the torch. It is plain that no one is yet acknowledged as the real equal of Tennyson. But we may have such a one among us even now. Although for three centuries the succession of English poets has never failed, there have been some brief periods when the most discerning eye must have failed to recognize the man. When Dryden died there must have been searchings of heart until the star of Pope rose above the horizon. And when Byron died young, like Keats and Shelley before him, and Coleridge, the poet, had long subsided into interminable monologues, neither Campbell, nor Scott, nor Southey, nor even Wordsworth, could be said to hold the poetic field. Wordsworth's, indeed, is a very striking case. His general reputation as a poet was hardly established till more than forty years after his first poems were published, and he was more than seventy before he received any public honor. And it may well be that we are all blind now, and that a new Tennyson, another Shelley or Milton, is in our midst, did we only know it. There is an element of hope perhaps in numbers. The English-speaking race is to-day quite three times as numerous as it was at the death of Byron, twelve times as numerous as it was at the death of Dryden, and those who can and who do write verses may be forty or fifty times as many. So the field is vastly larger.

But, alas! in poetry numbers count for much less than in presidential elections and other practical affairs. Indeed, in poetry, numbers and genius seem almost to stand in inverse ratios. When Shakespeare produced his plays, there were certainly not half a million persons living who could write English; and when the "Iliad" was first chanted at a festival, there was no man living who could write his name. There are now at least sixty millions who can write our language, and of these some millions, we may be sure, in public or in secret, compose lines that they fondly believe to be verse. What! not one prime poet in some million of versifiers? We do not see him

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yet. Neither Tennyson, Hugo, Heine, nor Longfellow has left any recognized equal and successor.

The strange part of it is that there never was an age when so great a quantity of very excellent verse was produced as in our own. There can be no doubt about it. We have to-day scores of elegant poets and hundreds of volumes of really graceful verse. Of educated men and women, at least one in three could turn out a passable lyric or so, far better than the stuff published as poetry in the age of Pope, or Jonson, or Southey. There are not so many true poets, perhaps, as there were in the lifetime of Spenser and of Shakespeare. But it may be truly said that at no period in the long history of English poetry has it been so free from affectation, mannerism, false taste, and conventional commonplace. Since verse began there has never been so high, so pure a level of third-rate verse. There are a dozen writers whose exquisite technique makes that of Dryden or Byron look quite careless and that of Pope monotonous, and there are at least a hundred writers who far surpass the imitators of Dryden, Pope, or Byron.

That perhaps is the ominous side of our high poetic standard. If out of such a mass of graceful verse we find no really great poetry, it would look as if there were something amiss. Can it be that we all think too much of this graceful form that so many can reach? Is it that we are all, writers and readers alike, under the glamour of a style which is not the less a "fashion" by being subtly harmonious and severely subdued? As the poet said, "all can raise the flower now, for all have got the seed." Poetry is raised too much now from another's seed, from a single seed, from what is indeed a highly specialized seed. And poetry mayhap has begun to suffer from the maladies which follow upon "breeding in-and-in": rickety bones, transparent and etiolated skins, exquisitely refined impotence. Neither readers nor writers intend it or even know it, but we are all looking for echoes of the "Idylls" or "In Memoriam": it becomes our test and standard; the poet is afraid to let himself go, lest he be thought Byronic and impatient of the "slow mechanic exercise" which not only sootheth pain but produces poetry. No age that ever fell under the spell of a style knew it at the time. Their contemporaries could not hear the eternal jingle in the papistic couplet when Pope's imitators produced volumes. People who listened to songs "in the manner of Tom Moore" were deaf to the doggerel of the words. Dryden in his day was the ruin of the poetasters who tried to catch his swing. So was Pope the ruin of his followers: they caught his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measured cadence; they could not catch his wit, his sparkle, and his sense. Dr. Johnson latinized the English language for a whole generation. And perhaps the perfections of Tennyson's art are among the causes that we have no perfect poetry.

Perfection of form is often, nay, is usually, a snare to its own generation. Raffaelle ruined "the school of Raffaelle," and so did Guido ruin the school of Guido. Intense attention to form, especially to a form which is capable of a high degree of imitation, too often leads to insipidity. How common now in the scholastic world is the art of elegant Latin verse! Our schools and colleges can show thousands of "copies" of faultless elegiacs and sonorous hexameters, with fewer flaws than you might pick in Statius and Claudian. But how dull, how lifeless, how artificial are these prize compositions if we read them as poetry! Faultless, yes; but we wish the author would now and then break loose into a solecism, and but for ten lines forget Ovid and Virgil. Much of our very graceful, very thoughtful, very virginal poetry is little but "exercises" in English verse composition to the tune, not of the "Tristia," but of "In Memoriam."

Now, the exquisite jewelry of Tennyson's method, subtle as it is, is imitable up to a certain point, just as Virgil's hexameter is imitable up to a certain point, and for the same reason. Both are the poetry of intense culture, inspired by the worship of form. I take a stanza typical of this art—a stanza not surpassed in melody by any poetry of this century—a stanza which is wonderfully prophetic of the poet himself and his enduring influence:

> "His memory long will live alone
> In all our hearts, as mournful light
> That broods above the fallen sun
> And dwells in heaven half the night."

That is simply perfect: a noble thought, an exquisite simile, a true and splendid analogy between Nature and Man, the simplicity as of marble, and a music which Shelley only has equalled. Yet it is imitable up to a measure: we can analyze the music, we can mark the gliding labials, the pathetic cadence in the "mournful light" and "dwells in heaven," the *largo* in "broods above." It is beautiful, but it is imitable, as Milton and Shakespeare are not imitable. Take Milton's—

> "He must not float upon his watery bier
> Unwept, and welter to the parching wind,
> Without the meed of some melodious tear."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Or again, "the last infirmity of noble mind," or "laughter holding both his sides," or "thy rapt soul sitting in thine eyes." Again, when Shakespeare says "the multitudinous seas incarnadine," or

> "We are such stuff
> As dreams are made on, and our little life
> Is rounded with a sleep."

This is not imitable. Both thought and phrase are incalculable. No other brain could imagine them; once heard they are indelible, unalterable, unapproachable. It is not the music which rivets our attention first, but the thought. The form matches the idea, but the idea transcends the form. Poetic form, we are often told, must be "inevitable." True, most true. But poetic thought also must be incalculable. For this reason the greatest poets who clothed incalculable thought in inevitable perfection of form—Milton, Shakespeare, Dante, Æschylus, Homer—never misled their generation into imitation, never founded "a school." We shall have a poet worthy to succeed Tennyson when we no longer have Tennyson on the brain.

It was passing strange that France should lose her greatest writer of prose within a few days of the blow by which England lost her greatest writer in verse. And some friends of both were present at the funeral in the *Panthéon* and in the Abbey. It was an eloquent contrast, suggestive of profound differences in our national idiosyncrasies and condition. The burial of Renan was a great ceremony of state, with military and official pomp, academic and bureaucratic dignity, pageantry, oratory, and public consecration in a civil monument now for the third time wrenched from the Church. The burial of the English poet was a simple and private act of mourning to which a multitude came in spontaneous sympathy. It had no dignity but that which was given it by the place—by the historic Past, by Poetry itself, and by at least the pathos of the old faith. France has broken with her Past, with the old religion, and she has no continuous poetic traditions. France is deliberately pushing forth on the ocean to find a New World. Nor has any of this generation done more to stimulate this movement than Ernest Renan. The founders of New Worlds cannot look to robe themselves in all the poetry and solemnities of the Old Worlds, but they may bear within them the Life and the Future.

Ernest Renan was a consummate master of the French language; and masters of language exercise a power in France which is not known to other nations and which is hardly to be understood in some.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He was a scholar, a man of learning, a subtle and ingenious critic. With his learning, his versatility, his romantic coloring, and his exquisite grace of form, it would have been singular if he had not acquired great influence. It was, of course, the influence of the critic: the solvent, dispersive, indefinite influence of the man of letters who hints his doubts and hesitates his creed. Renan assuredly had no creed, needed none, and was mentally incapable of conceiving himself as having a creed. I knew him personally, and have heard him expound his ideas in conversation and in lectures and also in private interviews. I do not believe that there was left in his mind an infinitesimal residuum of dogma, old or new. As the Cambridge scholar said, when he was asked to define his view as to the Third Person in the Trinity, he "would not deny that there might be a sort of a something" behind all that he knew and all that interested him so keenly. But for himself, his whole activity of brain was absorbed in the romantic side of history, in the lyrical aspect of religion, in the decorative types of philosophy.

Ideas of such mordant potency have seldom been clothed in a mantle of more spiritual religiosity of external hue. One can fancy the terror that he once struck into the tender Catholic spirit who for the first time heard these ghastly doubts issue forth, as it were, from a dreamy patristic hagiology. It was as when the Margaret of "Faust" kneels down in her agony before the image of the Madonna and hears her prayer answered by the strident mockery of Mephistopheles. But the tender Catholic spirit is grown stouter now and is inured to many things. We can see how Renan, so negative himself, so vague, and so allusive, is leading on to a knowledge more systematic than his own, more positive, more definite and real. He has been an influence in his generation, even though he hardly knew whither he was tending himself, and though such ignorance or mistiness appeared to him to be the true philosophic *nirvana* to which the wise only attain.

We are now in the age of mist. We are becoming very "children of the mist"; for the one dogma that seems destined to survive is the duty of being undogmatic. We have all learned to say with the poet, "our little systems have their day"; with the critic we all believe in "the power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness." That is comprehensive, large, suggestive. The definite, perhaps the intelligible, is limited: limitations mean narrowness, hardness, slavery, somewhere. "O friends," cries the popular preacher of to-day, be he layman or cleric, "let our spirits be free, let us seek to know, not to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decide; to analyze, not to believe. Away with the system-mongers and the slaves of any 'doxy.' Let us sip truth from every flower and leave the drones to brood over the honey!" The cultivated mind is becoming incapable of giving final assent to anything definite. It sees something in everything and error only in attempts to give that something a form. Of this philosophy and religion of the Great May-be, Monsieur Ernest Renan is the chief of the apostles; he is Peter and Paul and Doubting Thomas all in one very charming writer of French prose.

In the lull in our political world here in England, the ominous lull which precedes a great storm or a big battle, perhaps the most conspicuous political fact is the pace at which the municipal unity of London is gathering into action. The London County Council is the most composite elective body of which English history can show an example, and it has features which are rare, if not quite unexampled, in the history of municipal bodies. It has roused intense anxieties and bitter antipathies on the one hand, high hopes and a proud consciousness of a great future on the other hand. In its varied composition, in purity, and in thirst after reform, its most angry critics would hardly deny that it is remarkable. No municipal body ever collected such a diversity of interest and experience within one chamber. Even party rage has never ventured to hint a suspicion of jobbery, and this alone is a unique phenomenon, at any rate on our side of the Atlantic. About one-eighth of the Council are members of the Legislature, about a tenth have hereditary titles or are immediately connected with historic families; three ducal houses are represented; it counts two Knights of the Garter, the Foreign Secretary, and several other members of the government, peers, baronets, land-owners, bankers, brokers, merchants, lawyers, manufacturers, dealers of all kinds, and a dozen workmen in different trades.

So great a combination of interests bears witness to one of the strongest and most typical points in English life. There is no sulking or withdrawing in English public activity. All orders of men are equally eager to serve the public and contribute their experience. Duke and bricklayer work side by side in the same honest desire to do what they can and to offer what they know. Difference of principle there is, of course, and very divergent aims. But happily, in England, no class is excluded from serving the public and none excludes itself. And whatever the heat of strife may be, no section has found itself ostracized or silenced, nor has any imputed corruption to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its opponents. This is perhaps of all others the most hopeful sign in English public life. Men of wealth, of culture, of social distinction, are well aware that any claims they have must be justified by their own personal competence and by proof of their devotion to the public. They know this to be the price of their very existence as a class and of any consideration they may seek. And they are willing to pay.

A new body with interests so various, charged with working out a municipal life for London with its historic jumble of anomalous accretions, would be a poor thing if it did not show ambition, originality, and reforming zeal. Such a body is not likely to show either the deep wisdom of experience or the soberness of age. It will do things which its best friends think hazardous and say things which make its worst enemies exult. All the same, this development of municipal life in London, with its growing attention to Labor Ideals, is the most truly typical fact in our new political life. And, what is so puzzling to strangers who talk of the British aristocracy in the style of conventional ignorance, no men show more willingness to attend to the Labor Ideal than do men of rank and proved experience in affairs.

In any case, the growth of municipal energy is among the most stirring facts of our age. The claims which are now being matured in the London Council amount to the complete reorganization of the largest city in the world. To fuse a population of five millions, dwelling in portions of four counties and scattered over two hundred square miles, with hundreds of chance-medley local authorities and thousands of local acts—to make them an organic unit, while adjusting to the new body the mediæval corporation of historic London—is no light task. To recast the municipal taxation over this vast area, to throw a substantial part of that taxation on the owners of the soil and not on the occupants of tenements, to do something to make the Labor Ideal a reality, is now the ambition of the New Council. England, we are often assured, is the inveterate home of Feudalism, Privilege, and Routine. It may be so; but she is at last creating for herself municipal governments that genuinely represent the will of the people; wherein all orders of citizens, rich and poor, noble and simple, can meet on equal terms and work together with a will; wherein no suspicion of corruption has cast its shadow, and where, on every single vote and scheme, the interests of the laboring masses are most patiently considered and are advocated with eloquence and effect by genuine and honest leaders of the people.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FRENCH POLITICAL STABILITY AND ECONOMIC UNREST.

THE French Republic, the third of the name in less than a century, has just completed its twentieth year. It has escaped the dangers of its early childhood; it has passed successfully the trying years of growth and youth; it is now in its majority. Into political life enters a generation that has known no other form of government, that has had no share in the faults and in the lamentable end of the Second Empire. What ideas, what principles predominate among the people at the present hour? What currents of opinion are being formed? What new problems are forcing themselves upon the attention of the statesmen of France, which is so old as a nation and so young as a republic?

I will first call attention to a remarkable revival of public opinion with regard to colonial questions. Some years ago expeditions to remote places (such as Tonquin, Madagascar, etc.) were the cause of impassioned discussion. They occasioned the government the most serious embarrassment. The opposition party violently reproached it for the sacrifices of men and treasure demanded by the countries lately placed under the protection of France. According to this party, these new acquisitions cost much more than they ever brought, and as the sooner a piece of folly is mended the better, there should be no hesitation in evacuating countries that ought never to have been occupied. On this subject the radical and the monarchical press were unanimous.

To-day these arguments are almost never heard. Public opinion is reconciled to colonial enterprises; it would not permit them to be abandoned. It does justice to the clear-sightedness of the statesmen that seized the favorable moment for assuring to France new possessions outside Europe. The change seems due chiefly to the fortunate results obtained by the French protectorate in Tunis. This success, which has been rapid and is constantly growing, has made a great impression. It has given confidence. The people are asking if with equally able administrators the other countries that have recently come under the French protectorate may not also become a source of wealth and of increased power to the mother country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another very important and very marked change of opinion is shown in the rapid decomposition of the Royalist party, the opposition that attacked on principle even the constitution, that tried to overturn the public in order to substitute another form of government. This opposition is losing courage, breaking up and tending to disappear. A certain number of electoral districts still nominate Imperialist or Royalist deputies, but the number is decreasing constantly. The monarchical party resembles an army that is melting away day by day and will soon count fewer soldiers than officers. More than one among its officers refuse to continue a struggle that has become useless, and they will bend before the will which the country has repeatedly expressed and either renounce political life or rally openly to the republic. The past year has seen several notable examples of these, one of whom is Baron Mackau, formerly president of the *Union des Droits*, who has recognized that the suffrage of the people definitely founded the republic. In short, at the present time the constitution established in 1875 is accepted by nearly all Frenchmen—expressly by the great majority, tacitly by the greater part of the others. Before none of the governments that have succeeded in France during the past century has the opposition been thus disarmed. Each of them after a few years had to struggle against a coalition of opponents who redoubled their efforts and their audacity until they had thrown it down.

The opposite has happened in the third republic. Founded by the monarchists at a crucial period, its first years have been the most critical. It has at last attained a triumphant prosperity, and at the end of twenty years its adversaries seem to despair of destroying its vital force. This discouragement of the monarchical opposition, which since the elections of 1889 has been further accentuated, is due to the combination of a great number of circumstances, of which I shall repeat here only the principal. First, the disgrace that the Royalist party, under bad influences and poor leadership, has brought upon itself in mixing with the disreputable crowd that conducted the enterprise of General Boulanger. It has reaped from this disgraceful and unfortunate campaign only the shame of having taken part in it. The proof of its own unscrupulousness that it gave on this occasion has detached from it many of its best followers. Such an alliance could be justified only by a brilliant success. As they failed to attain this success, the alliance seems like a veritable moral suicide. What a sad end for the House of France! An underhand complicity with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dishonorable adventurers capable of any duplicity! Secondly, the French conservative party could not fail to profit in the long run by the lesson given it every day by neighboring countries. Does it not see that in Germany, for example, the Catholic minority, by force of patient energy and parliamentary cleverness, has made itself respected, even feared; that it has obtained successively the repeal of all the laws inimical to it; that it plays in the *Reichstag* an important and at times a decisive part? It is quite evident that neither of these results would have been obtained if the Catholic minority had not taken a relentless attitude and fought even the constitution of the new German empire. Does the conservative party in France display the same wisdom in depriving itself of every means of action for the pleasure of making a hopeless opposition to the constitution, whereas by accepting the constitution it could exercise a useful influence over public affairs and aspire even to direct them? Is it not better to be dubbed a Republican and have one's opinions respected than to be a Royalist-conservative and count for nothing?

In the eyes of ardent Royalists this reasoning would carry no weight; but the mere fact that it finds a large number of approvers is the best proof of the progressive and final disappearance of the monarchical idea. This idea, once very powerful in France, which consists in uniting in equal affection the reigning family and the country, in incarnating, so to speak, the nation in the sovereign, and still exists in varying degrees in England, Italy, and Germany, is so completely effaced from the mind of the French people that almost a miracle would have to take place for its regeneration. From one point of view, obligatory military service for all has exercised a profound moral influence. The youth of the country, passing under the flag, learn that political parties are of only secondary importance, that every man, whether Royalist, Imperialist, or Republican, owes equally his devotion and his blood to his country. The feelings are no longer understood of those noble *emigrés* who believed themselves Frenchmen to the finger-tips, and, nevertheless, fought in the ranks of the allies when they invaded France in 1814. To-day this seems criminal to the most devoted Royalists. This is because they, too, separate their duty to their country from their attachment to the royal family; because among them, too, the dynastic sentiment is no longer more than a shadow. This is the decisive reason among those that make monarchical restoration improbable and almost impossible: the vital spring of the monarchy, faith in a dynasty, exists no longer in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

France. The democratic spirit has replaced it. What, then, is left for the conservatives if not to rally to the republic?

Thus, in place of the ancient monarchical law, a constitutional law is being formed, always conservative, but none the less republican as well, and professing to respect the existing constitution. This constitutional law gives grave anxiety to the vigilant Republicans in power. How will they receive these recruits? It is quite out of their power to repulse them openly after proclaiming for years that the republic is open to all. It would be difficult, as well as imprudent, to shut out those that have at last decided to enter. On the other hand, to receive them without mistrust is perhaps equivalent to throwing open the door to an enemy that tries to worm himself in by guile after being convinced that he cannot enter by force. Shall they dispossess old servants of the Republican party to make place for these neophytes, who must be regarded with suspicion, even if they are sincere? Evidently not. These new converts, in the first place, shall have to give pledges and arm themselves with patience. It is only in heaven that the word of the evangelist is verified: "The last shall be first and the first shall be last." If the opposition, in rallying to the republic, wishes to convince public opinion of its sincerity, it ought to be extremely modest in its pretensions and prudent in its movements. New conditions need new men.

In a word, there is a delicate transition here, the more delicate because in it is involved a question of religious politics. So long as a restoration of the monarchy has seemed possible, the Catholic clergy have not concealed the direction of their sympathies. The Republican government has had to declare more than once with Gambetta that "clericalism is our enemy." The Catholic Church, on its side, complains of being persecuted. It regards the scholastic and military laws as machines specially directed against itself. But we must remember that in a late and very bitter conflict, perhaps more bitter than the preceding conflicts, the government found an altogether unexpected ally, the Pope. On those bishops that opposed the civil authority with extraordinary haughtiness and obstinacy, Leo counselled, then commanded, then imposed silence. The more the bishops have tried to interpret otherwise his counsels, the more his counsels have taken the form of precise and pressing injunctions; so that at last the bishops, obliged to submit or openly to disobey, have had, much to their disgust, to give up resistance. And the pope has not only put an end to this irritating conflict, but he has also missed no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

occasion of recommending to the faithful the sincere acceptance of the form of government which the popular will has established in France. He has thus made a conspicuous separation of the cause of the Catholic religion from the cause of the monarchy. Henceforth a good Catholic, in France, can be without scruple a Republican in fact and in name.

An ally of this magnitude is always a little embarrassing, especially when he presents himself uninvited. The Republicans regard Leo as a very politic pope, a man of superior intelligence, and one who by the breadth of his mind and by his understanding of the social conditions of modern times makes a strong contrast with his predecessor, Pius IX. But the majority observe with some disquietude his friendly attitude toward the republic. So much graciousness puts them on the defensive. They feel that the rabid enemies of the existing government, by suddenly transforming themselves into its supporters, can be more dangerous in the ranks of the majority than in the ranks of the opposition, and that, above all, if they should become the strongest faction in this majority a formidable eruption would forthwith break out, sweeping away the work of the past twenty years. The Republicans, therefore, are disposed to see in this sudden conversion, not so much a sincere adhesion to the republic, as a clever move against which they must guard. Then, too, the intervention of the pope in the home policy of France gives them serious worry. Is there no danger in an authority that can be exercised over a large number of electors? It can let loose a tempest just as it can calm one. Leo is very old. Who will guarantee that his successor will not follow an entirely different line of conduct? Now, a pope hostile to the Republican government would perhaps find his counsel followed with as much ardor, at least by the higher clergy, as the ill-will encountered by Leo XIII. At the present time this quarter is tranquil, but it may well hold in store for the future more than a painful surprise.

In the region of economics there is a manifestation of the beginnings of a still, but an already perceptible, reaction against protection, which has been dominant in the commercial policy of France for three years. Its victory has been complete. It was planned with great forethought. The agricultural and industrial interests that needed protection, instructed by long and hard experience, had learned to consider themselves united in interest. They joined forces and formed a kind of indissoluble combination. Together they attained what each demanded. But they have perhaps abused their advantage. Many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

violent complaints have been heard. The interests that need free trade are in turn suffering and are disturbed. Although the two Chambers are actually protected (the Senate, at least, as much as the Chamber of Deputies), they will nevertheless be obliged to yield a point if public opinion becomes more pressing. It is possible that public opinion has been influenced by the defeat just sustained by the partisans of high protection and of the McKinley bill in the United States. A return to the policy of free trade is not to be thought of; that is, it is at least unlikely so long as a complete trial of the new tariff has not been made. But we have reason to believe that protection will be obliged, as the saying is, to water its wine.

The reaction against protection would at once become more rapid if, as many think, it led to an increase in the price of the necessaries of life. In this event public opinion would not long endure an economic system unfavorable to the welfare of the poorer classes. There is at the present time a popular impression that the misery of the poor is a social injustice: to lessen it if one can is a duty, to aggravate it would in any case be a crime. Can this be called socialism? No, if this word is taken in its rigid acceptation. However, there is no denying that socialism attracts more and more the interest of the public. People are saying that the relations of capital and labor are not what they ought to be, that there must be some change in the method of distribution of wealth in order to make it more just. The demand that misery be diminished by better social organization, that the most shocking inequalities be corrected, at least to a certain degree, by the intervention of the state—this is certainly a socialistic idea, and it has of late made great progress in France. We have socialists of all kinds—"possibilists," "collectionists," "Christian socialists," without counting all those that have no clear views and feel simply a general sympathy with the masses and their claims against capital.

But as soon as they have to go beyond vague generalities and propose something positive and precise, the difficulties begin. On the one hand, many people lean toward a sentimental socialism so long as this does not menace their revenue; but they make a complete change of attitude as soon as their purse has to suffer. On the other hand, the socialists are far from being in accord among themselves: not only their discussion of principles, but, above all, their personal quarrels paralyze their action and rob them of nearly all their power, principally at the time of elections. The masses have not had political training, and it is often their ill-fortune to give their confidence to un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worthy leaders. However, in spite of its drawbacks, the workingmen's party is making progress and appears destined still to do something if it avoid all compromise, however slight, with the anarchists.

Lack of space prevents me from characterizing here the new tendencies that are now manifesting themselves in art and literature, particularly in the novel, which seems to be turning from the excess of brutal naturalism without losing the advantages of realistic exactitude. But I cannot close this article without recalling the memory of Ernest Renan, whose death has been a great blight upon the literature of the year just closing. Renan was undoubtedly the foremost of the French prose-writers of this century and one of the foremost in the rich literary history of France. We may dispute the value of his learning, the solidity of his historical work, the profundity of his philosophical thought; nevertheless we cannot forget that he was one of the first in France to assimilate the results of German biblical criticism and to render accessible to the great public the doctrines of Hegel and Schopenhauer. But whatever judgment posterity may pass upon him in this regard, two facts are undeniable: first, the extraordinary influence that Renan has exercised upon the minds of his generation, which, like him, divided between diverse tendencies and preoccupied with being sincere with themselves, have tried to preserve religious sentiment without faith.

Then his incomparable charm as a writer! With him, art attains to that supreme degree of perfection where it is no longer perceived. His natural and exquisite style seems to flow from a spring: its harmony is as unobtrusive as scholarly. His prose, with its gentle and smiling irony, is winged, like Plato's. Renan has had this privilege of the greatest writers: his word has been able to reach every one. He filled the vast expanse between the heights of philosophical and historical science and the jaded curiosity of the ordinary reader. This professor of Hebrew at the College of France, this decipherer of Semitic inscriptions, this assiduous contributor to the "*Journal Asiatique*," could also give the most exquisite treat to lovers of literary style when it pleased him to refresh himself with a philosophical fantasy, or when he consented to write his recollections of his childhood and youth. France still possesses thinkers and writers, but no writer with both his largeness and his subtlety of thought; no thinker whose words have the seductive magic of Renan and who knows like him how to touch the heart.

L. LÉVY-BRUHL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GERMAN SOCIALISM AND LITERARY STERILITY.

In 1791 appeared a little book called "Ideas for Defining the Limits of the Activity of the State," by a youthful philosopher who afterward became one of the prominent statesmen of his age, Wilhelm von Humboldt. In opposition to the antique doctrine, which absolutely sacrifices the individual to the state, the author regards the state as a necessary evil, which, in the interests of personal liberty, must be confined to the narrowest limits. According to him, its only justifiable task is to provide for external and internal safety, and he denies its right of meddling with other questions of general or individual welfare, because such interference tends to suppress personal initiative and to constrain the citizens into a uniformity degrading to character. This theory, an anticipation of the views of the most radical wing of the later Manchester school, was a revolt against the prevailing German system of paternal government, which meddled with the smallest details of private life. The Prussian Code (*Landrecht*) of that time, for instance, prescribed that every healthy mother was in duty bound to suckle her child herself.

But Humboldt's theory, in itself influenced by Rousseau's doctrines, was untenable and afterward gave way to the exactly opposite one of Hegel. Hegel regarded the state as the realization of the moral idea, which thinks and knows itself and executes what it knows and wills; consequently the state is a reasonable being in itself and the principal duty of the individual is to be a member of it. In practice the system prevailing in Germany till 1848 was that of a well-meaning, honest, and intelligent bureaucracy, which, particularly in Prussia, realized great progress, but left little room to individual activity in public life. The battle then was about the constitution, the respective rights of the Crown and the Chambers, the individual rights of citizens, while at the same time the power of the ubiquitous bureaucracy remained unshaken. It was only during the time of reaction which followed this period that some eminent lawyers, particularly Gneist and Bucher, showed by their studies that the gist of Anglo-Saxon liberty lay not in the parliamentary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system but in the local self-government, in the administration of affairs by the citizens themselves, and in the independence of the magistrates.

The truth of this leading idea was soon universally acknowledged and realized by the Prussian organization of circles (corresponding somewhat to English-American counties) of 1872 (amended in 1881), and by the organization of provinces in 1875, both of which, first enacted for the old provinces, were gradually and with modifications extended to the whole monarchy. Formerly the provinces and circles were only administrative divisions of the state, while the centre of gravity was lying in the government districts (*Regierungsbezirke*); with the new organization an organic division was effected into provinces, circles, and local communities (parishes). The centre of gravity has now become the circle, which has a preëminently rural character, cities of more than twenty-five thousand inhabitants forming independent townships.

This was a real organization of self-government, but there were two drawbacks to it: first, the work was not begun at the foundation by the organization of the rural communities, a thorny task indeed, only completed for the seven eastern provinces of Prussia by the law of July 3, 1891; secondly, the government districts (*Regierungsbezirke*) were maintained, its president being now assisted by an executive committee, which at the same time exercises the functions of an administrative court of justice for the district. This has greatly complicated the administration, doubts often arising about the competence of the different organs, which must be decided by the superior court of administrative justice at Berlin. Similar institutions exist in the middle and minor German states, into the details of which it would lead too far to enter; but, taken in all, their organization undoubtedly constitutes a real progress, which has given the necessary sound foundation to representative government in Germany.

Important as this politico-administrative change was, the social movement during the last twenty years was of a still wider range. Social questions in themselves are indeed as old as society itself. The first man to direct attention to the paramount importance of social problems and the condition of the working classes was Professor Huber, but his indefatigable exertions were crowned with little success. Perhaps, too, because politically he was an absolutist, more attention was given to the eloquent expositions of Professor Riehl, who first in his book, "The Civil Society," and in further numerous writings, in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sisted that the social structure of a nation was decisive of its political organization.

But the man who practically brought forward the social question as the topic of the day in Germany was Ferdinand Lassalle. Morally, Lassalle was a man of the lowest order, a modern Alcibiades. Accustomed to good fare, he never spent a farthing for the benefit of the working classes, and he used them only as a footing for his personal ends, which culminated in his becoming president of a German republic. Moreover, his scientific doctrines were not those of an independent thinker: the whole of his polemics against the existing order of society was borrowed from the writings of Karl Marx, without credit to the author; and the only positive proposition he advanced, that of establishing manufactures with state help, was not an original one and had proved unpractical by the wreck of the French *Ateliers Nationaux* of 1848. But he was a powerful demagogue, and by his eloquence he stirred the masses; he persuaded them of the truth of the pretended iron law of wages, which never allowed the working classes to rise above the level absolutely necessary for existence.

After his death the movement was taken in hand by more consequent followers, such as Liebknecht and Bebel, and soon became a power, gradually increasing by the introduction of universal suffrage, which first gave the lower classes the possibility of exercising a practical influence in public affairs. These men, in different shades, represent socialism, a word first used long ago by a disciple of Saint-Simon, Pierre Leroux, who, as he said, coined the expression in opposition to individualism, and held it to signify an organization in which the individual was sacrificed to society. In its extreme, such a system never has existed and never will exist. It is also wrong to maintain that the socialists of to-day would abolish all property, in the sense that no one could have anything of his own, and the wild hostility against all human and Divine order which many of them undoubtedly show is not founded in the essence of socialism. But men who widely differ from the social democrats have also adopted the name, sometimes given to parties as a nickname, and thus much confusion has arisen by the indiscriminate use of this term. We must therefore establish what is the real gist of socialism in order to see clearly, before we can discuss the different social parties. It is simply the doctrine which aims at replacing individual production by collective production.

The socialists do not impugn the necessity of the division of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor, but maintain that by its present organization the higher classes, if not by law yet by practice, turn to an undue advantage the work of the lower classes. The law does not prevent the laborer from doing a certain kind of work, but the freedom of choice to work where he likes practically does not exist; the liberty of trade is in fact that of choosing the work he cannot but do, or starve. The workmen as the slaves of capital are in fact the disinherited. They are commanded, as Marx says, by the employer, not because the employer has special capacity for directing, but because he has the necessary capital for combining the forces of production. Thus the workmen do not get the full produce of their work, but only as much as is absolutely necessary for their existence. The present capital is the result of conquest, serfdom, privileges, plundering the colonies, sequestered church property, and of that process of forming new capital at the expense of the working classes, which are by themselves unable to contend against it. The capital shall not be suppressed, but it must, together with the production, become collective.

How this is to be realized German socialists have never clearly explained; the more rational demand a centralized organization, and the hour for this, according to Marx, will have come when the present process of accumulating capital has reached its climax; then "the usurpers will be expropriated." This expression can hardly be understood otherwise than that their property will be confiscated for the general benefit. The so-called May Programme of 1875 demands that the state shall organize, under the democratic control of the working classes, societies for every branch of production which, in their totality, shall represent the socialist commonwealth. Thus there would be an end of all competition, money would become useless, and all work would be paid by assignments giving right to a certain amount of commodities accumulated in public stores. How this best of worlds is to be set at work, our socialists have never said. The liberal member for the *Reichstag*, Eugene Richter, has written a very amusing pamphlet exposing the general confusion which would arise in this state of the future. One of the more moderate socialists, Rodbertus, says: "The state must make provision in order to guarantee to the workman for the average work of eight to ten hours wages corresponding to the present social condition of the working classes and the state of national production." But he adds himself, "But will it ever be possible to establish such provision?" and he does not answer his question.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These economical problems are far too intricate for the understanding of men who have only gone through the elementary schools. The great bulk of German social democrats are simply people discontented with their present situation. If they read at all, it is the party papers and cheap popular books or novels, cleverly compiled to excite the passions of the masses by incendiary diatribes against the existing order of society, and painting in glowing colors the material well-being which would await them with the victory of socialism. In fact, social democracy in Germany is not so much a party doctrine as a creed. These ignorant masses do not discern that the very name of the party is in itself a contradiction, that in the socialistic state there would be no democracy, but a despotism compared to which Russian autocracy would be liberty, because the state becoming the sole employer, distributing the work and paying for it, everything would be in the hands of the leaders. Even now there is no party in which these are so absolutely the masters; they give the cry for everything and are implicitly obeyed; any opposition is firmly put down. Their policy is above all to excite hatred, to revile religion and to preach materialism; to discourage thrift by attracting the workmen to frequent socialist meetings, where they spend their wages in drink and are intoxicated by the speeches of the agitators. Their success is in great part the consequence of Bismarck's ill-advised social policy. After coquetting with the socialists, using them against the progressists, he enacted in October, 1878, an exceptional law against social democracy, placing its members outside the pale of the law.

But whoever imagines to put a stop to a social movement by coercive measures shows his complete ignorance of human nature. This measure had the contrary effect of making social democrats martyrs of a persecuted cause, and acted as an iron circle, welding them into a solid phalanx, as was proved by their constantly increasing numbers in the elections. At the same time Bismarck introduced a series of measures in the sense of state socialism, declaring that it was utterly indifferent to him whether they might be called socialistic (sitting of the *Reichstag*, April 2, 1881), and he even openly recognized the right of labor (sitting of May 9, 1884). He thus acknowledged socialism in principle, which is organizing labor by the state and yet is an impossibility, because the state can neither find work for every one, nor is it competent to fix the wages for every laborer according to merit.

Such authoritative utterances, disguised as practical Christianity,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but defended by a terminology borrowed from the leaders of socialism and coinciding with the outlawing of social democrats, went far to accord to the movement that impulse which, according to all historical experience, is the strongest and most dangerous—the sting of suffering injustice and at the same time the recognition that the socialist demands are just in themselves. They could only increase the excitement of the masses, the more as the Chancellor strenuously resisted all attempts of the *Reichstag* to pass laws for the protection of women's and children's labor, for Sunday rest, for the amelioration of factory inspection, etc., and as his protective fiscal policy, taxing heavily the necessaries of life, was mainly in the interests of the great land-owners and manufacturers. As to the social laws which he carried, the compulsory insurance against sickness and accidents is at least practicable, for the danger of the workman's being visited by such evils is definite and concerns only a limited number of cases; but the insurance against old age and invalidity is a totally different question, as it will comprise more than ninety per cent of the insured.

First, the handling of the law requires an enormous bureaucratic administration, the task of which will be to decide the innumerable litigious cases. Then the burden of those who have to raise the necessary funds is very considerable. It is divided between the workingmen, who have to pay twenty-one *pfennige* per week, the law not saying whence they shall raise their contribution when they are without work; the proprietors of factories are to contribute, according to a preliminary calculation, fifty-five million marks, a sum which, in addition to those funds they have to pay for accidents and sickness, is very heavy, and can only cause the employers to try to discharge part of this expense on the workingmen by a reduction of wages. The last third, also about fifty-five millions, is to be paid by the imperial exchequer, a provision which is open to strong objections, for to fix such a contribution as a legal claim is very different from the subsidiary local relief of the indigent. The state cannot make presents except from what its citizens pay as taxes, and the larger part of imperial taxation is derived from duties on articles of primary necessity, such as corn, flour, wood, salt, etc. The stipend which the workingmen can claim at seventy years of age will be for the most part so insufficient that the receivers will remain indigent. The law, carried only by a diffident and narrow majority, which acknowledged that it was a leap in the dark, will prove a costly failure.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For the rest, the measures carried after the Chancellor's fall have much improved the situation. The tacit abandonment of the law against social democracy has had the beneficent consequence that the socialists have begun to quarrel among themselves. The measures already mentioned for the protection of labor have been carried, factory inspection has been ameliorated, useful reforms, such as that of the income tax, by which the wealthier classes have to pay according to their real revenue, and the lowering of customs, however insufficient, on the necessaries of life, by commercial treaties, have shown the genuine care of the present government for the welfare of the working classes; and if it sometimes lacks decision in its reforms, as was lately shown in the Prussian mining act where it submitted to the demands of the great owners, it is at least well-meaning and open to reason, so that the outlook is not unpromising.

The greatest drawback still is the protective system introduced in 1879 by Bismarck, formerly an ardent free-trader. First, it has made life dearer by plundering the masses for the benefit of the few, because even if the wages have risen, as is maintained but not proved by the defenders of the tariff, they have not the same purchasing power; then by excluding foreign, it has increased the internal competition and led to over-production; while other states raising their tariffs equally have rendered more difficult the access of their markets to German products. Therefore industry and trade are in a state of stagnation. The manufacturers endeavor to mitigate this evil by forming trusts limiting the production and distributing the provision of customers by a sort of rotation. But the usefulness of this measure is doubtful. First, such trusts come forward only when overproduction has made a limitation of work necessary; consequently they have led to the discharging of workmen, who are without employment; further, very large manufactories of articles the sale of which is subject to great vacillations are not likely to enter upon such restriction. Even the existing unions are liable to dissolution by new inventions or by a rising condition of the market, as those members who may profit by such circumstances will not renounce the benefits arising from them. But the worst is that if the trusts really succeed in a certain branch they monopolize the prices, maintaining them at the level procured by the protective duties and realizing the totality of the premium accorded by such duties. The root of the evil is the artificial fostering of industry and agriculture by protection, and the only cure lies in attacking this root.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The extension of the large industry has brought the smaller craftsmen into a difficult situation. Small and large establishments are swallowed up in limited liability societies; new inventions make constantly labor in itself more productive, but reduce the number of workmen; and this economy of labor is not outweighed by the extension of production—on the contrary, the supply of hands exceeds the demand, and thus the lower classes can absorb only a small quantity of the goods thrown upon the market, for their scanty means have not sufficient purchasing power. This tendency is increased by the German poor-law, which provides that every person who has resided two years in a place has a right to public charity; this promotes the improvident conclusion of marriages and over-population, as, according to experience, the indigent families are those which multiply most, and self-restraint is least to be expected from uneducated proletarians.

But Germany suffers also from an intellectual over-production. All professions are over-crowded. It was fondly believed up to our days that the state had no more important task than to render the acquiring of knowledge as easy as possible, and for that purpose to establish many higher schools. But it was not asked whether there was room enough for employing men when their education was finished. Taking, for instance, the career of law in Prussia, we find that there were (October 1, 1891) 1,851 "assessors," *i.e.*, men who have not only passed through the gymnasium and the university, but have already served the state gratis for about five years, while the annual average demand is one hundred. There are more than seven thousand examined architects without a fixed employment; it is the same with engineers, teachers in classics, mathematics, etc. These unemployed forces are particularly attracted to the great capitals, because every one hopes that with the many chances they offer he will find a gap into which he may jump. If he has means to enable him to wait he may sometimes succeed, but if he has not he will probably go to the dogs. Men of university training are, almost without exception, capable only of intellectual work. If they do not succeed in their branch they cannot become tailors or carpenters; they must take to pettifogging, giving lessons, copying, writing for inferior papers, etc. There are lawyers, physicians, doctors of philosophy, among those who are regularly relieved by the Berlin Poor Board. All these men are, of course, discontented with the present state of things, and ready to join with those forces which hold out hope of overthrowing it. Nor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are female candidates wanting in this proletariat; all those who give cheap lessons, write mediocre novels for low-class journals, or work for shops at starvation wages, are swelling the army of social revolution.

Socialist writers do not deny the material and intellectual over-production, but they find in the vicious circle of excessive demand, crises, and stagnation the proof that the production must be systematically regulated by the community. This, however, would imply the cessation of individual composition, for as long as it exists the producers will make mistakes in the calculation of supply and demand, and even the officials of the socialistic state will be exposed to such mistakes unless the individual consumption is fixed per head once for all, as it is in a jail—a remedy worse than the evil, as it would suppress all personal liberty. On the other hand, it is clear that over-population cannot be refuted by the fact that only a third part of the earth is properly cultivated. Over-population is the disproportion of the means of subsistence to the number of men in a given district; it is therefore always local, and the over-crowded industrial cities of Saxony can find no relief in the knowledge that the valley of the Mississippi has still room for millions if these have not the means of getting there.

These economic facts have of course given rise to other social parties and doctrines. Curiously enough, the political liberals belonged mostly to the economical conservatives, *i.e.*, to the Manchester school. This party undoubtedly deserves the credit of having done away with the remnants of mediæval restraint of labor; by its exertions the feudal restrictions upon landed property and the old guilds, which confined the exercising of a craft to a limited number of privileged persons, were suppressed, and progress was made toward free trade. But in building up a system for which they claimed universal validity, they overlooked the fact that the economic development much depended upon other social factors. The historical school showed that the law prevailing in a community was of the greatest importance for political economy. "Every economic act," says Roscher, "presupposes forms of law; the simplest things, such as the sale of a commodity, its delivery to the purchaser, and the payment of the price, repose on certain prescriptions regulating the fulfilment of contracts." And no domain of the law is in this respect more important than the laws of succession regarding a man's property after his death.

Yet all these laws vary much in different countries; therefore it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impossible to build up an abstract deductive economic system without regard to them, and the tendency of the Manchester school to reduce the state to an establishment of insurance against external attacks and for maintaining internal order is practically out of the question. Another school founded in 1872, that of the Pulpit-Socialists (so called because its chief representatives were professors), went further; without subscribing to the socialist doctrines, they admitted that there was some foundation for the grievances of the social democracy. The workmen indeed could never obtain the full produce of the total labor process; the idea of estimating the value of a commodity exclusively by the work bestowed upon it was wrong; that value was, on the contrary, regulated by the law of supply and demand, and an organized collective production was, with the universal competition of the world's markets, a chimera. Yet it was to be acknowledged that the workman, free by law to do what he chose, was virtually dependent upon the employer, and the state as the natural protector of the weak was bound to assist him in securing fair terms. They have had some influence upon the above-mentioned social policy of the government. Separate party branches are formed by the conservative agrarian reformers and by the Christian social party. The former insist that modern legislation has been preëminently in favor of the mobile capital, and that the landed property has thus been prejudiced. Backed by the influence of Prince Bismarck, they have obtained undue privileges in taxation, but the real cause of their distress lies in the indebtedness of the large estates, arising from the fact that the eldest son inherits the property but has to mortgage it in favor of his younger brethren.

The Christian social party is much given to these same tendencies. But it particularly insists upon the necessity of maintaining Christian institutions, and at the same time is hostile to the Jews. Now, I am far from contending that this influence exists and is not a beneficent one. The German Jews, forming little more than one per cent of the population, exercise by their wealth and in the press a power which is often used against Christianity. But this is greatly an inheritance of the past, during which Jews were prohibited from cultivating the land or entering upon any other career than trade; so they naturally became almost exclusively trades-people and money-lenders; and I confess that in this whole anti-Semitic movement I have not perceived one pracical idea for limiting the Jewish influence, for it is clearly impossible to deny the Jews the suf-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

frage and the free choice of profession when the constitution of the Empire establishes that civil rights are to be absolutely independent of the religious creed.

German science maintains its high standard, and fortunately it is, as likewise art and literature, not centralized as in France, where Paris absorbs the provinces. If Berlin honorably maintains its place, Munich, Leipzig, Bonn, and other universities are important centres of scientific activity, maintaining a life of their own, where talents find more room for free and original development and are less subject to the caprices of fashion. As regards art, Munich perhaps is superior to the Prussian capital, which certainly has painters and sculptors of genius, but where most of them are too much spoiled by society, being dependent not upon the real connoisseurs, but upon the "*nouveaux riches*," who want something out of the ordinary to decorate their gilded drawing-rooms. The Munich opera, too, is probably superior to that of Berlin, and so is the Royal drama; on the other hand, Berlin has, besides the Royal stage, several high-class theatres, such as the German and the Berlin theatres for higher dramatic art and the Lessing Theatre for the modern social drama, in all of which the acting is excellent. But it is not only the princely residences that have good plays; nearly every larger city has its theatre, for which the citizens make considerable sacrifices, and some, as for instance those of Hamburg, Mannheim, Cologne, maintain a high standard. Music in general is a preëminently German art, and so you find everywhere excellent concerts. As to musical composition, Wagner is still the great man of the day, and the representations of his operas at Bayreuth attract large cosmopolitan audiences. Brahms is the only other living composer of note, the last leader of the romantic school, Robert Franz, having just died.

But if musical and dramatic art in Germany deserves all praise, the same cannot be said of literature. It is notable that the German victories and the enthusiasm with which the unification of the Fatherland was hailed have not produced a single first-rate poet. Of the numberless plays which have seen the footlights during two decades, scarcely any has achieved lasting fame. An exception may perhaps be made for Sudermann's "Honor" and some of Gerhard Hauptmann's dramas, which show a considerable talent; but the rest of the new school of the "young ones" who fill the "*Freie Bühne*" revel in coarse naturalism, and on the other side Wildenbruch, whose talent in higher dramatic art at first looked promising, has sunk to a court

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poet. As a novelist he has given some first-rate pictures of small size, but he is certainly surpassed by Sudermann's powerful novels, "*Frau Sorge*," "*Der Katzensteg*," "*Die Geschwister*." For the rest there is little worth mentioning. Paul Heyse in his latest novel, "Merlin," has launched into an elaborate attack against the naturalistic school, which, directed against the coarse and feeble imitators of Zola, is certainly well founded; but the book in itself is a decided failure. Ebers continues to write a volume per year of his dull historic novels, and so does Felix Dahn in his falsification of history. As a proof of the deplorably bad taste prevailing in northern Germany, we may quote the fifty editions of Stinde's "Buchholz Family" and its sequels, which embody the very essence of Berlinese platitude. The reason why so few German novels and dramas give a really faithful picture of the higher society is that, as a rule, the authors are not admitted into its circles. This is still more true of the journalists; there are of course among them clever and well-educated men who would be an ornament to any drawing-room.

It is not easy to give a sketch of German society in general, as it differs so widely in its various centres. As to the nobility, there are of course magnates made rich by the extension of their estates, but their number is comparatively limited, as the younger sons inherit the title without the property, and not having sufficient means to support the noble name, are obliged to serve in the army or the civil service. Nevertheless, with the exception of those who make rich marriages in the wealthy *bourgeoisie*, they mostly keep apart, and if they are brought into contact with other classes by politics, literature, or art (the women by common activity in charities), this does not lead to social intimacy. The higher officials, but particularly the wealthy *bourgeoisie*, form the backbone of the middle classes; the former, if they have not some fortune of their own, are frequently in straitened circumstances, as the salaries are low, and yet their social position forces them to keep up certain appearances. However, they contrive to pull through honorably and maintain their state by a strong sense of duty and honor traditional in German service, and the same must be said of the lower officials, although it is scarcely credible how they can live upon their miserable salaries. Among the good old stock of the *bourgeoisie* there are very rich merchants and mill-owners, who as a rule have a simple style of living: their houses are handsomely furnished, they give to their children the best education,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they encourage the fine arts, they do much in the way of charities, but all this without show.

A decided contrast to this class, as well as to the nobility, is formed by the "*nouveaux riches.*" Their fortunes have no history even if they buy estates; they owe their wealth to clever speculations or to happy inventions; a certain number of them have acquired their fortunes at the exchange or in trade, most of them in industrial enterprises, and the riches realized in some of them are often fabulous. This class is to-day found in every large capital or mercantile place, but it is comparatively more numerous and influential in Germany, as it has not to contend against a firmly-established wealthy aristocracy as in England or a *Faubourg St. Germain* as in Paris. The way in which these mushroom grandees spend their money corresponds generally to that in which they have got it; they rarely have ideal interests, and if they buy pictures or subscribe to charities it is to show that they can afford it; they invite noblemen and artists to adorn their drawing-rooms decorated in gorgeously bad style, and, on the whole, the coarse display of their upstart riches does more than anything to foster the hatred of the lower classes against the higher ones, while such an antagonism is rarely shown toward the nobleman who lives upon his estate, caring for his peasants, or toward merchants who by long and hard labor have acquired wealth. May we hope that this honorable class will have the force to absorb those nabobs?

But if we augur well of Germany's future, it is particularly because we have a stout peasantry, cultivating their own hereditary estates, and a strong class of intelligent craftsmen. Both of these form the most solid bulwark against social democracy, and it is the strengthening of these elements which should be the principal task of the government.

GEFFCKEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAN MORAL CONDUCT BE TAUGHT IN SCHOOLS?

WITHIN a few years a strong demand has arisen for ethical teaching in the schools. Teachers themselves have become interested, and wherever they are gathered the question, "What shall this teaching be?" is eagerly discussed. It was the chief topic of discussion last summer at the National Council of Teachers at Saratoga. The educational journals are full of it. Within a year there have been published seven books on the subject. Several of them—it would be hardly an exaggeration to say all—are books of marked excellence. Seldom does so large a percentage of books in a single year, in a single country, and on a single subject reach so high a level of merit. I shall not criticise them, however, nor even engage in the popular discussion of which they form a part. That discussion concerns itself chiefly with the methods by which ethics may be taught. I wish to go behind this controversy and to raise the previous question whether ethics should be taught to boys and girls at all.

Evidently there are strong reasons why it should be. Always and everywhere it is important that men should be good. To be a good man! It is more than half the fulfilment of life. Better to miss fame, wealth, learning, than to miss righteousness. And in America, too, we must demand not the mere trifle that men shall be good for their own sakes, but in order that the life of the state may be preserved. A wide-spread righteousness is in a republic a matter of necessity. Where all rule all, each man who falls into evil courses infects his neighbor, corrrupting the law and corrupting still more its enforcement. The question of manufacturing moral men becomes, accordingly, in a democracy urgent to a degree unknown in a country where but a few selected persons guide the state.

There is also special urgency at the present time. The ancient and accredited means of training youth in goodness are becoming—I will not say broken—but enfeebled and distrusted. Hitherto a large part of the moral instruction of mankind has been superintended by the clergy. In every civilized state the expensive machinery of the Church has been set up and placed in the hands of men of dignity,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because it has been believed that by no other engine can we so effectively render people upright. I still believe this, and I am pretty confident that a good many years will pass before we shall dispense with the ennobling services of our ministers. And yet it is plain that much of the work which formerly was exclusively theirs is so no longer. Much of it is performed by books, newspapers, and facilitated human intercourse. Ministers do not now speak with their old authority; they speak merely as other men speak; and we are all asking whether in the immense readjustment of faith now going on something of their peculiar power of moral as well as of intellectual guidance may not slip away.

The home, too, which has hitherto been the fundamental agency for fostering morality in the young, is just now in sore need of repair. We can no longer depend upon it alone for moral guardianship. It must be supplemented, possibly reconstructed. New dangers to it have arisen. In the complex civilization of city life, in the huge influx of untutored foreigners, in the substitution of the apartment for the house, in the greater ease of divorce, in the larger freedom now given to children, to women, in the breaking down of class distinctions and the readier accessibility of man to man, there are perils for boy and girl which did not exist before. And while these changes in the outward form of domestic life are advancing, certain protections against moral peril which the home formerly afforded have decayed. It would be curious to ascertain in how many families of our immediate time daily prayers are used, and to compare the number with that of those in which the holy practice was common fifty years ago. It would be interesting to know how frequently parents to-day converse with their children on subjects serious, pious, or personal. The hurry of modern life has swept away many uplifting intimacies. Even in families which prize them most, a few minutes only can be had each day for such fortifying things. Domestic training has shrunk, while the training of hap-hazard companions, the training of the streets, the training of the newspapers, have acquired a potency hitherto unknown.

It is no wonder, then, that in such a moral crisis the community turns to that agency whose power is already felt beneficently in a multitude of other directions, the school. The cry comes to us teachers, "We established you at first to make our children wiser; we want you now for a profounder service. Can you not unite moral culture with intellectual?" It may be; though discipline of the passions is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enormously more difficult than discipline of the mind. But at any rate we must acknowledge that our success in the mental field is largely staked on our success in the moral. Our pupils will not learn their lessons in arithmetic if they have not already made some progress in concentration, in self-forgetfulness, in acceptance of duty. Nor can we touch them in a single section of their nature and hope for results. Instruction must go all through. We are obliged to treat each little human being as a whole if we would have our treatment wholesome. And then, too, we have had such successes elsewhere that we may well feel encouraged for the new task. Nearly the whole of life is now advantageously surveyed in one form or another in our schools and colleges; and we have usually found that advance in instruction develops swiftly into betterment of practice. We teach, for example, social science and analyze the customs of the past; but soon we find bands of young men and women in all the important cities criticising the government of those cities, suggesting better modes of voting, wiser forms of charity; and before we know it the community is transformed. We cannot teach the science of electricity without improving our street-cars, or at least without raising hopes that they may some day be improved. Each science claims its brother art. Theory creeps over into action. It will not stay by itself; it is pervasive, diffusive. And as this pervasive character of knowledge in the lower ranges is perceived, we teachers are urged to press forward its operation in the higher also. Why have we no school-books on human character, the highest of all themes? Once direct the attention of our pupils to this great topic, and may we not ultimately bring about that moral enlargement for which the time waits?

I have stated somewhat at length the considerations in behalf of ethical instruction in the schools because those considerations on the whole appear to me illusory. I cannot believe such instruction possible. Were it so, of course it would have my eager support. But I see in it grave difficulties, difficulties imperfectly understood; and a difficulty disregarded becomes a danger, possibly a catastrophe. Let me explain in a few words where the danger lies.

Between morals and ethics there is a sharp distinction, frequently as the two words are confused. Usage, however, shows the meaning. If I call a man a man of bad morals, I evidently mean to assert that his conduct is corrupt; he does things which the majority of mankind believe he ought not to do. It is his practice I denounce, not his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intellectual formulation. In the same way we speak of the petty morals of society, referring in the phrase to the small practices of mankind, the unnumbered actions which disclose good or bad principles unconsciously hidden within. It is entirely different when I call a man's ethics bad. I then declare that I do not agree with his comprehension of moral principles. His practice may be entirely correct. I do not speak of that; it is his understanding that is at fault. For ethics, as was long ago remarked, is related to morals as geometry to carpentry: the one is a science, the other its practical embodiment. In the former, consciousness is a prime factor; from the latter it often is absent altogether.

Now, what is asked of us teachers is that we invite our pupils to direct study of the principles of right conduct, that we awaken their consciousness about their modes of life, and so by degrees impart to them a science of righteousness. This is theory, ethics; not morals, practice; and in my judgment it is dangerous business, with the slenderest chance of success. Useless is it to say that the aim of such instruction need not be ethical, but moral. Whatever the ultimate aim, the procedure of instruction is of necessity scientific. It operates through intelligence and only gets into life so far as the instructed intelligence afterward becomes a director. This is the work of books and teachers everywhere: they discipline the knowing act, and so bring within their influence that multitude of matters which depend for excellent adjustment on clear and ordered knowledge. Such a work, however, is evidently but partial. Many matters do not take their rise in knowledge at all. Morality does not. The boy as soon as born is adopted unconsciously into some sort of moral world. While he is growing up and is thinking of other things habits of character are seizing him. By the time he comes to school he is incrusted with customs. The idea that his moral education can be fashioned by his teacher in the same way as his education in geography is fantastic. It is only his ethical training which may now begin. The attention of such a boy may be called to habits already formed; he may be led to dissect those habits, to pass judgment on them as right or wrong, and to inquire why and how they may be bettered. This is the only power teaching professes: it critically inquires, it awakens interest, it inspects facts, it discovers laws. And this process applied in the field of character yields ethics, the systematized knowledge of human conduct. It does not primarily yield morals, improved performance.

Nor indeed is performance likely to be improved by ethical en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lightenment if, as I maintain, the whole business of self-criticism in the child is unwholesome. By a course of ethical training a young person will, in my view, much more probably become demoralized than invigorated. What we ought to desire, if we would have a boy grow morally sturdy, is that introspection should not set in early and that he should not become accustomed to watch his conduct. And the reason is obvious. Much as we incline to laud our prerogative of consciousness and to assert that it is precisely what distinguishes us from our poor relations, the brutes, we still must acknowledge that consciousness has certain grave defects when exalted into the position of a guide. Large tracts of life lie altogether beyond its control, and the conduct which can be affected by it is apt—especially in the initial stages—to be rendered vague, slow, vacillating, and distorted. Only instinctive action is swift, sure, and firm. For this reason we distrust the man who calculates his goodness. We find him vulgar and repellant. We are far from sure that he will keep that goodness long. If I offer to shake hands with a man with precisely that degree of warmth which I have decided it is well to express, will he willingly take my hand? A few years ago there were some nonsense verses on this subject going the rounds of the English newspapers. They seemed to me capitally to express the morbid influence of consciousness in a complex organism. They ran somewhat as follows:

"The centipede was happy, quite,
Until the toad for fun
Said, 'Pray which leg comes after which?'
This worked her mind to such a pitch
She lay distracted in a ditch,
Considering how to run."

And well she might! Imagine the hundred legs steered consciously —now it is time to move this one, now to move that! The creature would never move at all, but would be as incapable of action as Hamlet himself. And are the young less complex than centipedes? Shall their little lives be suddenly turned over to a fumbling guide? Shall they not rather be stimulated to unconscious rectitude, gently led into those blind but holy habits which make goodness easy, and so be saved from the perilous perplexities of marking out their own way? So thought the sagacious Aristotle. To the crude early opinion of Socrates that virtue is knowledge, he opposed the ripened doctrine that it is practice and habit.

This, then, is the inexpugnable objection to the ethical instruction

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of children: the end sought is performance, not knowledge, and we cannot by supplying the latter induce the former. But do not these considerations cut the ground from under practical teaching of every kind? Instruction is given in other subjects in the hope that it may finally issue in strengthened action, and I have acknowledged that as a fact this hope is repeatedly justified. Why may not a similar result appear in ethics? What puts a difference between that study and electricity, social science, or manual training? This: according as the work studied includes a creative element and is intended to give expression to a personal life, consciousness becomes an increasingly dangerous dependence. Why are there no classes and text-books for the study of deportment? Is it because manners are unimportant? No, but because they make the man, and to be of any worth must be an expression of his very nature. Conscious study would tend to distort rather than to fashion them. Their practice cannot be learned in the same way as carpentry.

But an analogy more enlightening for showing the inaptitude of the child for direct study of the laws of conduct is found in the case of speech. Between speech and morals the analogies are subtle and wide. So minute are they that speech might almost be called a kind of vocal morality. Like morality, it is something possessed long before we are aware of it, and it becomes perfect or debased with our growth. We employ it to express ourselves and to come into ordered contact with our neighbor. By it we confer benefits and by it receive benefits in turn. Rigid as it is in its laws, we still feel ourselves free in its use, though obliged to give to our spontaneous feelings forms constructed by people of the past. Ease, accuracy, and scope are here confessedly of vast consequence. Yet it has been found a matter of extreme difficulty to bring a young person's attention helpfully to bear upon his speech. Indirect methods seem to be the only profitable ones. Philology, grammar, rhetoric, systematic study of the laws of language, are dangerous tools for a boy below his teens. The child who is to acquire excellent speech must be encouraged to keep attention away from the words he uses and to fix it upon that which he is to express. Abstract grammar will either confound the tongue which it should ease, or else it will seem to have no connection with living reality, but to be an ingenious contrivance invented by some Dry-as-dust for the torture of school-boys.

And a similar pair of dangers await the young student of the laws of conduct. On the one hand, it is highly probable that he will not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

understand what his teacher is talking about. He may learn his lesson; he may answer questions correctly; but he will assume that these things have nothing to do with him. He becomes dulled to moral distinctions, and it is the teaching of ethics that dulls him. We see the disastrous process in full operation in a neighboring field. There are countries which have regular public instruction in religion. The argument runs that schools are established to teach what is of consequence to citizens, and religion is of more consequence than anything else. Therefore introduce it, is the conclusion. Therefore keep it out, is the sound conclusion. It lies too near the life to be announced in official propositions and still to retain a recognizable meaning. I have known a large number of German young men. I have yet to meet one whose religious nature has been deepened by his instruction in school. And the lack of influence is noticeable not merely in those who have failed in the study, but quite as much in those who have had the best success. In neither case has the august discipline meant anything. The danger would be wider, the disaster from the benumbing influence more serious, if ethical instruction should be organized; wider, because morality underlies religion, and insensitiveness to the moral claim is more immediately and concretely destructive. Yet here, as in the case of religion, of manners, or of speech, the child will probably take to heart very little of what is said. At most he will assume that the text-book statement of the rules of righteousness represents the way in which the game of life is played by some people; but he will prefer to play it in his own way still. Young people are constructed with happy protective arrangements; they are enviably impervious. We pour out our choicest thoughts upon them, and if they are not suitable for the little life it draws its cover over and not a drop penetrates. So in expounding moral principles in the school-room, I believe we shall touch the child in very few moral spots. Nevertheless, it becomes dulled and hardened if it listens long to sacred words untouched.

But the benumbing influence is not the gravest danger; analogies of speech suggest a graver still. If we try to teach speech too early and really succeed in fixing the child's attention upon its tongue, we enfeeble its power of utterance. Consciousness once awakened, the child is perpetually inquiring whether the word is the right word and suspecting that it is not quite sufficiently right to be allowed free passage. Just so a momentous trouble appears when the moral consciousness has been too early stirred. That self-questioning spirit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

springs up which impels its tortured possessor to be continually fingering his motives in unwholesome preoccupation with himself. Instead of entering heartily into outward interests, the watchful little moralist is "questioning about himself whether he has been as good as he should have been, and whether a better man would not have acted otherwise." No part of us is more susceptible of morbidness than the moral sense; none demoralizes more thoroughly when morbid. The trouble, too, affects chiefly those of the finer fibre. The majority of healthy children, as has been said, harden themselves against theoretic talk and it passes over them like the wind. Here and there a sensitive soul absorbs the poison and sets itself seriously to work installing duty as the mainspring of its life. We all know the unwholesome result: the person from whom spontaneity is gone, who criticises everything he does, who has lost his sense of proportion, who teases himself endlessly and teases his friends—so far as they remain his friends—about the right and wrong of each petty act. It is a disease, a moral disease, and takes the place in the spiritual life of that which the doctors are so fond of calling "nervous prostration" in the physical. Few countries have been so desolated by it as New England. It is our especial scourge. Many here carry a conscience about with them which makes us say, "How much better off they would be with none!" I declare at times when I see the ravages which conscientiousness works in our New England stock, I wish these New Englanders had never heard moral distinctions mentioned. Better their vices than their virtues. The wise teacher will extirpate the first sproutings of this weed; for a weed more difficult to extirpate when grown there is not. We run a serious risk of implanting it in our children when we undertake their class instruction in ethics.

Such, then, are some of the considerations which should give us pause when the public is clamoring at our school-house doors and saying to us teachers, "We cannot bring up our children so as to make them righteous citizens. Undertake the work for us. You have done so much already that we turn to you again and entreat your help." I think we must sadly reply, "There are limits to what we can do. If you respect us, you will not urge us to do the thing that is not ours. By pressing into certain regions we shall bring upon you more disaster than benefit."

And yet I hope every reader is dissatisfied with this result and is indisposed to give up the pressing problem at this stage. Fully as the dangers here pointed out may be acknowledged, much of a differ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ent sort remains also true. Have we not all received a large measure of moral culture at school? And are we quite content to say that the greatest of subjects is unteachable? I would not say this; on the contrary, I hold that no college is properly organized where the teaching of ethics does not occupy a position of honor. The college, not the school, is the place for the study. It would be absurd to maintain that all other subjects of study are nutritious to man except that of his own nature; but it is far from absurd to ask that a young man first possess a nature before he undertakes to analyze it. A study useless for developing initial power may still be highly profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. Youth should be spontaneous, instinctive, ebullient; reflection whispers to the growing man. It is a sound principle of modern education that questions should not be answered before they are asked; and many of the evils that I have thus far traced are brought about by projecting upon a young mind problems which it had not yet encountered in itself. Such problems abound in the later teens and twenties, and then is the time to set about their discussion.

Yet even in college I would have ethical study more guarded than the rest. Had I the power, I would never allow it to be required of all. It should be offered only as an elective and in the later years of the course. When I entered college I was put in my Freshman year into a prescribed study of this sort. Happily I received no influence from it whatever. It passed over me without touching me; and I think it had no more effect on the majority of my classmates. Possibly some of the more reflecting took it to heart and were harmed; but in general it was a mere wasting of precious ointment which might have soothed our wounds if elected in the Senior year. Of course great teachers defy all rules; and under a Hopkins, a Seelye, or a Hyde, the distinctions of elective and prescribed become unimportant. Yet the principle is clear: wait till the young man is confronted with the problems before you invite him to their solution. Has he grown up unquestioning? Has he accepted the moral code inherited from honored parents? Can he rest in wise habits? Then let him be thankful and go his way untaught. But has he, on the other hand, felt that the moral mechanism by which he was early guided does not fit all cases? Has he found one class of duties in conflict with another? Has he discovered that the moral standards obtaining in different sections of society, in different parts of the world, are irreconcilable? In short, is he puzzled and desirous of working his way

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through his puzzles, of facing them and tracking them to their beginnings? Then is he ripe for the study of ethics.

Yet when it is so undertaken, when those only are invited to partake of it who in their own hearts have heard its painful call, even then I would hedge it about with two conditions. First, it should be pursued as a science, critically, and the student should be informed at the outset that the aim of the course is knowledge, not the endeavor to make better men. And, secondly, I would insist that the students themselves do the work; that they do not passively listen to opinions set forth by their instructor, but that they address themselves to research and learn to construct moral judgments which will bear critical inspection. Some teachers, no doubt, will think it wisest to accomplish these things by tracing the course of ethics in the past, treating it as a historical science. Others will prefer, by announcing their own beliefs, to stimulate their students to criticise those beliefs and to venture on their own little constructions. The method is unimportant; it is only of consequence that the students themselves do the ethicizing, that they trace the logic of their own beliefs and do not rest in dogmatic statement. Yet such an undertaking may well sober a teacher. I never see my class in ethics come to their first lecture that I do not tremble and say to myself that I am set for the downfall of some of them. In every such studious company there must be unprepared persons whom the teacher will damage. He cannot help it. He must move calmly forward, confident in his subject, but knowing that because it is living it is dangerous.

But is this all? An elective course in college is a slender provision for supplying the needy multitude of youth with moral help. The fact is that the line which I have attempted to draw between consciousness and unconsciousness, between the age which is best directed by instinct and the age when the questioning faculties put forward their inexorable demands, is a wavering one and cannot be sharply marked. By one it is crossed at one period, by another at another. Seldom is the crossing noticed. Before we are aware, we find ourselves in sorrow on the farther side. Happy the youth who during the transition time has a wise friend at hand to answer a question, to speak a steadying word, to open up the vista which at the moment needs to be cleared! Only one in close personal touch is serviceable here; but in defect of home guidance, to us teachers falls much of the charge of developing the youthful consciousness of moral matters naturally, smoothly, and without jar. This has always been a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part of the teacher's office. So far as I can ascertain, schools of the olden time had in them a large amount of wholesome ethical training. Schools were unsystematic then; there lay no examination paper ahead of them; there was time for pause and talk. If a subject arose which the teacher regarded as of importance for his pupils' personal lives, he could lead them on to question about it, so far as he believed discussion useful. This sort of ethical training we have largely exterminated in the hurry of our time; and now that the wholesome incidental instruction is gone, we demand in the modern way that a clear-cut department of ethics shall be introduced into the curriculum. These things do not let themselves be treated in departmental fashion. The teacher must still work as a friend. He cannot be discharged from knowing when and how to stimulate a question, from discerning which boy or girl would be helped by consciousness and which would be harmed. In these higher regions our pupils cannot be approached in classes; they require individual attention; and not because we are teachers merely, but because we and they are human beings, we must be ready with spiritual aid.

But neither college instruction nor the incidental aid of priestly teachers—things which after all can affect only exceptional lives—is an adequate provision for steadying the average boy during his formative years. Moral agencies are requisite for this, moral not ethical, agencies more covert, more encompassing, which shall surround the youth and bear him up at all times, regardless of whether he is strong in mind or will. For we mistake if we fancy that morality enters a man merely by his permission and under his own superintendence. It is not true that each of us is called on to create a scheme of conduct, nor should moral discipline be addressed to invigorating the faculties for such constructive work. It should be directed rather to accustoming the uneasy individual to adjust himself naturally to a moral order already existing, one which forms indeed the very basis of the world which he inhabits. Only so much teaching, accordingly, is needful as will habituate the child to a responsive respect for institutions. Institutions themselves will take care of him afterward. For institutions are nothing but organizations of conduct, expressing the judgment of our race as to the ways in which the usual human desires may attain their fullest orderly expression. These normal desires of ours have been known for centuries. By what ways they may meet their appropriate issue has been a matter of world experiment. Proved ways have been incorporated into racial habits, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these being passed from father to son form the most precious inheritance which any of us receive. To such organized habits the young life at birth is handed over, and henceforth his moral education consists in bringing him to perceive that the institutions which surround him are not things foreign to him, but things which sweetly and friendlily answer to his desires. To say that he matures is to say that he discovers this moral guidance all around him, perceives the world to be a moral world, and knows that his business in it is not to build it anew from the foundation, but gratefully to accept its system, while ever ready to offer such subordinate criticism or readjustment as will tend to make the whole more harmonious. To bring him into vital connection with the world he lives in is the business of his moral guardians. How far can school and college help in the work?

Just so far as they can surround those committed to their charge with the unnoticed pressure of a moral world. In the early part of this paper the dangers of premature consciousness of moral matters were pointed out, and it was insisted that ethical training should wait for the later years. Moral training, on the other hand, is always in season and can never be safely intermitted. To describe its method we might borrow from the hypnotizers their word "suggestion," for suggestion differs from ordinary teaching chiefly in a single respect: in suggestion we approach the subject while he is unconscious and while the will is dormant. Then we find that we can make the deepest impression. What we see occurring under the obscure conditions of hypnotism goes on in a less marked degree in every school-room. What we teach at unawares we may be said to teach by suggestion, and in that way it penetrates and becomes the pupil's own. If it has been moral suggestion, he finds himself when he awakes to consciousness richly endowed with moral habits. For this reason I hold that it is not so much to the instruction of the school or college as to its management and temper that we must look for moral aid. That school where neatness, courtesy, and simplicity obtain; where enthusiasm goes with mental exactitude, thoroughness of work with interest, and absence of artificiality in surroundings with refinement; where sneaks, liars, loafers, pretenders, rough persons, are despised—that school is engaged in moral training all day long. It is not necessary to call a class for recitation in the subject; for every class, whether it recites or not, shows if it has learned its lesson. We masters do nothing more important than establishing among our students sentiments about what constitutes good form. There will be little need of class

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

instruction after we have succeeded in charging with full meaning the usage of a few perpetual words—"gentleman," "good fellow," "square dealing." These are the clumsy means that carry high influences far and fast among boys. To affect favorably a few such vague conceptions is worth years of effort.

And then, last of all, if suggestion instead of conscious instruction is to be effective, teachers must submit to be admired. They must allow their pupils to idealize them, and even furnish grounds for the admiration. It is not pleasant. Usually nobody knows better his own weaknesses than the one who is mistaken for an example. But what a helpful mistake! What ennobling influences come to schoolboys when once they can think their teacher is the sort of person they would like to be. Perhaps at the very moment he is thinking they are the sort of person he would like to be. But no matter. What they admire is worthy, even if not embodied precisely where they imagine. In humility we must accept their admiration, knowing that nothing else can so enlarge their lives. As I recall my college days, there rise before me two teachers. As I entered the rooms of those two men, I said to myself, "O! if some day I could be like that." And always after, as I went to those respective rooms, the impression of dignity deepened. I have forgotten the lessons I learned from those instructors. I never can discharge my debt to the instructors themselves.

GEORGE HERBERT PALMER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JAY GOULD AND SOCIALISM.

THERE are two radically distinct views of business. Some people regard it as a fight between buyer and seller; others regard it as a means of mutual service. In the one case, the business man is a licensed robber; in the other, he is a public benefactor. The former view prevailed in mediæval times; we still see survivals of it in the attitude of trades-unions toward employers, of the Farmers' Alliance toward Wall Street, of the extreme protectionists toward England, and of the Socialists toward modern business as a whole. The other and more liberal view is generally accepted by business men to-day and lies at the foundation of modern industrial society.

The world of trade is organized on the assumption that a man makes money best by giving the public what it wants. If his goods command a high price, it is because they meet an actual need; if that price furnishes him a large margin of profit, it is because he has known how to produce them to the best advantage. So confident are we of this substantial identity of interest between the business man and the community as a whole, that we give our capitalists the freest chance to direct the productive forces of society to their own individual profit. If, in so doing, they render society the service which is expected of them, they furnish the strongest argument for the continuance of the existing system; if they fail to render such service, whether it be through mailce or through ignorance, they furnish an equally strong argument to those who advocate its overthrow.

The contrast between the two types of business corresponding to these views was never so sharp as in the years immediately following the war. Many of the things which had previously limited the power of business men for good or for evil were done away with. New methods removed the restraints of tradition; large combinations rendered the action of competition uncertain. The intricacies of railroad accounting, puzzling enough at best, afforded in those years an almost unlimited opportunity for concealment of facts from a public which knew much less of these things than it does to-day. The man who controlled the capital of a hundred others besides himself had the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power to do either good business or bad business on a scale previously unknown.

Of those who took the opportunity to do good business, Commodore Vanderbilt may serve as an example—not that he was actuated primarily by unselfish motives in his work. His immediate object was to make money. But he made it on the lines in which financiers as a class had won their position of power in the community. He applied to larger business the methods which had made ordinary business honorable. He sought his gain in others' gain, not in their loss. He used his power of combination to make railroad freight cheaper, thereby increasing the volume of traffic to such an extent that he himself was more than repaid, and not he himself alone, but also those who had intrusted him with the administration of their money.

The profits of Vanderbilt were the profits of the New York Central Railroad and its connecting lines; the profits of those lines were not made by cheating the shipper, but by offering him lower rates than the world had ever before dreamed of, lower than the state railroad systems of Europe, managed by the representatives of the socialistic principle, have even yet been able to attain. In the years from 1870 to 1879 the rates charged by the New York Central Railroad fell from $1.88 per ton per mile to $0.78; but the stockholders found a rich profit in the increase of the traffic from seven hundred and sixty-nine million tons miles to two billion two hundred and ninety-five million. Nor do these facts measure the whole good done by the railroad men of that day. The activity of Vanderbilt and others like him compelled a general reduction in railroad charges unexampled in any other country, which, in spite of the abuses connected with it, meant quick development for the United States and plentiful food for the world. Business methods and business management raised the transportation system of the country to a higher degree of efficiency and higher capacity for public service than government management has anywhere been able to secure.

Commodore Vanderbilt's work is thrown into sharper relief by the career of business men of another class who treated finance as a fight and sought their gain in others' loss—not that the fighting element was by any means absent from Vanderbilt's financial career; but Vanderbilt fought his rivals and not his associates. "He was one of those who ate when he was hungry and drank when he was thirsty, loved his friends and hated his enemies." There were others, however, to whom friendship and enmity were matters of little consequence as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compared with the absorbing aim of money-getting: men who did not hesitate to use their positions of trust and authority to plunder those whom they were supposed to represent; who took advantage of the intricacies of railroad accounting to deceive investors as to the real condition of affairs, and used their own superior knowledge to buy stocks cheap or sell them dear. Such men's gain was represented by no public service. It was not based on the creation of wealth, but on its diversion from the purse of some one else. Destruction might serve such men's purposes as well as upbuilding. When the Erie directors were speculating for a fall in the price of their own stocks, a horrible accident on their road proved a welcome auxiliary to their schemes. They did not cause this accident themselves; but the fact that they had put themselves in a position to profit by it made matters almost as bad. The public cannot afford to have its largest enterprises in the hands of those whose personal gain is to be found in managing them badly. Such a state of affairs may not always wreck trains, but it is sure to wreck reputations.

A great many men of this sort made money; but comparatively few, even in the worst days of American corporate finance, won the consideration which is supposed to attach to the possession of money. Some of them, like Fisk, simply defied public opinion; they pleaded guilty to the charge of financial immorality by engaging in flagrant private immorality also. A man like Fisk in the long run probably did as much good as harm to financial morals. His personal character cast a stigma on his financial operations, his social outlawry helped men to see his business methods in their true light.

Jay Gould was a man of a wholly different sort. His was not the stuff of which outlaws are made. His private character was in strong contrast with his financial schemes and methods. The very differences which made him a better man than Fisk perhaps enabled him to do more harm to the business community by continuing his career for a much longer period and meeting less outspoken disapproval. Such disapproval as there was he neither attempted to propitiate nor to defy. The contrast between Gould's public and private morality is not easy to explain. It may be that his great financial power was attended with lack of normal moral development—that he suffered, in short, from the obliquity of genius. Or it may be that he believed the common charge that the American public valued success in money-getting too highly to be over-critical about the means by which it was reached, and that he had only to maintain for a few years a position

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the head of the financial world to secure from society a bill of indemnity for his past offences.

If so, he was mistaken. The American public proved better than its reputation. It never acquiesced in Gould's methods. It passed laws to prevent the repetition of his worst offences. It drew the lines of financial legality closer as the years went on. What he did in Erie could not have been repeated in Union Pacific half a dozen years later. What he did in Union Pacific was worse than he was allowed to do in Manhattan. What he did in Manhattan could hardly be repeated in the same form to-day. Loose as are our financial methods even now, they show a tremendous advance over the worst days of Erie and Kansas Pacific. Nor was society ready to forgive and forget the flagrant violations of business morals which had marked the early days of Gould's career. The newspaper comments on his life furnish a sufficient refutation of the charge that America cares for nothing else in comparison with success in the pursuit of wealth.

Yet there is something not wholly consistent in the attitude of many who judge Gould most severely. The excesses which society condemns were in one sense but the accidents of his career—superficial evils as compared with the essentials which it countenances. It is like the rejection of Zola by the French Academy for going a little farther than others in a direction for which French public sentiment is responsible. The radical evil in Gould's career lay in his conception of business as a game instead of a means of public service. The public condemns him because he played the game unfairly. It may be better to condemn him and ourselves both for playing the game at all. The wrong which he did to investors in Erie or the Union Pacific is easy to recognize. The wrong he did to society as a whole is not so easy to recognize, but it is equally dangerous, in one sense far more dangerous; for it is one which society as a whole countenances rather than condemns.

Society gives its great financiers a trust, compared with which all other trusts sink into insignificance. It gives them the power of directing the labor and capital of the country. We have seen how a man like Vanderbilt deserved that trust, by using it for the benefit of society. What does a man of the opposite type do to deserve it? Less than nothing. When the Gould securities rose on the news of the great speculator's death, it was not alone the investors who were interested. The increase in the value of the property meant a possibility of better management for the public as a whole. The interests

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the investor are important; but the chief element of their importance lies in the fact that under good management they are identified with the far wider interests of the public. No one would measure Vanderbilt's services to the business of the country by the profits of his bonds, but by the good management and wide-spread benefit which such profits represent. Nor can Gould's wrongs be measured by the losses to the investor, great as those may be, but by the failure to attain high standards of management and public efficiency, which those losses represent. The public benefit in the one case or the public wrong in the other is wider than the private benefit or the private wrong to the investors. Whoever treats money as anything less than a public trust not only does a public wrong, but endangers existing social institutions. Whoever even fails to recognize the existence of such a trust countenances the wrong and courts the danger.

The most effective check upon the evils of universal suffrage lies in the fact that the industries of the country are managed, not by votes, but by property. Of all the "checks and balances" in our social system, the most important is this balance between the political organization of the voters and the industrial organization of the property-holders. Each acts as a check upon the other. It is a division of powers far more fundamental than that of executive, legislature, and judiciary; one which reaches down to the roots of things as deeply as did the separation of church and state in the Middle Ages. It is the aim of the socialists wholly to do away with this separation of industrial and political powers; it is the constant effort of bodies like the Farmers' Alliance to restrict the former and extend the latter. Universal suffrage gives such efforts a great apparent advantage; but as long as business men do their duty there is little to fear from such movements. If a man's personal advantage is identified with the success of his business; if his position in the financial world is dependent on his competence in the industrial world; if, in short, he arranges to stand or fall with the success or failure of his management, then we have a process of natural selection under which leaders like Vanderbilt inevitably come to the front, while their less competent rivals are pushed into the background. If the industrial and financial struggle actually brings the best men forward, they show their ability in such a manner that we have little to fear from the encroachments of the political power. If, on the other hand, the question of control is settled in the "Street," instead of in the workshop; if the possession of financial authority is made to depend on success in stock operations,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather than on success in organizing producers and meeting the wants of consumers, then we have a process of selection by which leaders like Mr. Gould come to the front, driving out competitors who might serve the public better, though they have not known how to serve themselves quite so well. When the wrong men are brought forward, the industrial system is in real danger, because it does not do what the public has a right to demand of it. Whoever countenances this view of business, though he may not approve all the things that Gould did, nevertheless must share the responsibility for the essential features of his career and the socialistic dangers connected with them.

Our system of business ethics is behind the times. It is based on the financial conditions of the past, when money was chiefly valuable as a means of enjoyment. It does not take into account the new conditions which arise from the use of money as a source of industrial power. There is a whole set of new duties which the financial world must recognize if it would retain that industrial power in the future. It is not enough to abstain from robbing some one else of the enjoyment which money commands; we must also use the power which money gives us as a means of positive service. There are a great many men who do this; but there are few who recognize the extent of our obligation to do it. The obligation is ignored in the thoughtless gambling of every-day life, violated in much of the habitual practice of reputable financiers, and antagonized and undermined by the work of some of the most eminent members of the legal profession.

The man who gambles away his money is not simply parting with his own enjoyment, but with his control of the industrial forces of the community. It is not like selling his labor: it is like selling his vote. If a man sells his labor, our chief fear is that he may do an injustice to himself. If he sells his vote, we know that he is doing an injustice to society. Society intrusts its voters with political power and its property-owners with industrial power, in the belief that their intelligent judgment will direct its affairs to the best advantage; if they refuse to exercise that judgment the penalty in either case is and must be disfranchisement. The results of gambling are not to be measured by its effect on the pockets of the parties immediately concerned, any more than the results of bribery are to be measured by its effect in a single election. It teaches men a wrong view of the ethics of money. It educates them to ignore a public trust and look only at the means of private enjoyment.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our financiers condemn such robbery or fraud as constitutes a plain violation of the old-fashioned ethics of money; but they often fail to recognize the necessity of taking a broader view of their duties under modern conditions. Take the "Gentlemen's Agreement" as an example. In the year 1887 an unusually large amount of new railroad mileage was built, much of it in advance of actual necessities. There was also a great deal of adverse legislation. As a result, railroad dividends in 1888 fell, and investors naturally became unwilling to put their money into railroad securities. This was an absolutely normal and healthy condition of things: it stopped railroad-building until the demand for transportation facilities should again exceed the supply and profits be restored. But many of our largest financiers saw in this backwardness of investors only an obstacle that prevented them from marketing the securities in which they dealt, and they set to work to restore public confidence by the formation of a much-heralded traffic agreement among the lines of the West. The more frank and outspoken among the railroad officials who were called to help in forming that agreement pointed out that, in its original form at any rate, there were no means of carrying it into effect. They were politely but plainly told to keep their difficulties to themselves, that the object of the meeting was to restore public confidence, and that the public would be frightened if the elements of weakness were made known. Fortunately for the community, public confidence was not restored until something more had been done to deserve it; but the kind of effort that was then made, by most honorable financiers, shows how completely their self-interest as dealers in securities had made them forget their larger responsibilities as managers of industrial enterprises. They would have shrunk from the means used by Gould; they would not have recognized that their sort of work was the same as that for which they condemned him. But the difference was one of degree rather than of kind.

The attitude of the legal profession in this matter invites even sharper criticism. Lawyers of high reputation not merely treat money-getting as a game, but carry the conception of a game to extremes. They take large fees for teaching people how to come as close as possible to the limits which the rules of the game allow, and do not thereby forfeit their standing in the profession. They would probably say that it was the business of the law-makers to prohibit unfair means of money-getting, and that any man had a right to take advantage of what the law allowed. But the dangers to the financial world which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arise from the prevalence and toleration of such a view are overwhelming. It not only ignores the purpose for which such great powers were granted to the representatives of wealth, but it actually invites the political authorities to limit those powers. It looks to the politicians and not to the business men as the source of care for the widest interests of the country. If business men are not to be controlled by commercial ethics—ethics fitting the economic conditions of to-day, not those of five hundred years ago—they must expect to be controlled by something else. If they will not accept the full measure of responsibility which goes with their industrial power, they must expect to be deprived of responsibility and power together by a popular movement in the direction of socialism.

Jay Gould did more than any one else to tempt such a movement; but he was aided and countenanced by every financier whose interests in the stock-market led him to forget the interests of his properties, by every lawyer who taught his clients to evade the responsibilities attaching to wealth, by every man who in the excitement of the gaming-table lost sight of those responsibilities—by every one, in short, who forgot that under the existing system the possession of money involved a public trust, with whose fulfilment or non-fulfilment that system must stand or fall.

ARTHUR T. HADLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WRITERS FOR THE JANUARY FORUM.

MR. HENRY HUCKS GIBBS (*The Crisis in Silver*), born in London in 1819, was educated at Rugby and Oxford, and is now at the head of the firm of Antony Gibbs & Sons. He was Governor of the Bank of England in 1875, a delegate for England (with Mr. Goschen) to the Paris Monetary Conference in 1878, and Member of Parliament for the city of London in 1891. He is now President of the Bimetallic League and a member of several scientific and literary societies.

HON. HENRY BACON (*Shall the State-Bank Tax be Repealed?*), born in Brooklyn, N. Y., in 1846, was graduated at Union College, New York, in 1865, and in 1866 was admitted to the Bar in Brooklyn. He was elected to Congress in 1886, was sent to the 49th Congress to fill a vacancy during a short session and during the full term of the 50th Congress. He was made a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency in both these sessions, and was chairman of the Committee on Manufactures of the 50th Congress. He was re-elected to Congress in 1890. He is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the 52d Congress and a member of the Judiciary Committee. In July, 1892, he was elected President of the Goshen National Bank.

DR. EDWARD ORAM SHAKESPEARE (*Necessity for a National Quarantine*), born in Dover, Del., in 1846, was graduated at Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., in 1867, and at the medical department of the University of Pennsylvania in 1869. He settled first in Dover, Del., and in 1874 removed to Philadelphia. In 1885 he was sent by the United States Government to those European countries where cholera prevailed to study the causes and the methods of preventing and curing this disease. He is a member of several leading medical societies, and he has made several notable inventions in surgical instruments.

MR. FRANCIS MARION CRAWFORD (*What is a Novel?*), born in Lucca, Italy, in 1854, was educated under private tutors at Rome, at St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H., at the University of Cambridge, England, and at the German universities. After travelling extensively in Europe and in the East, he came to New York, and in 1882 he wrote his first novel, "Mr. Isaacs," which at once leaped into popularity. He has since resided chiefly in Italy and published many novels, among them "Doctor Claudius," "A Roman Singer," "Zoroaster," "A Tale of a Lonely Parish," "Saracinesca," "The Witch of Prague," and "Don Orsino."

MR. GEORGE FREDERICK PARKER (*What Immigrants Contribute to Industry*), born in Lafayette, Ind., in 1847, removed with his father to Iowa

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in 1854, where he was educated in the public schools, and at the State University at Iowa City. In 1873 he became editor of a county newspaper and later editor of the leading Democratic paper at Des Moines. He became Assistant Postmaster of Philadelphia in 1885, resigned and resumed newspaper work in New York in 1887. He is Auditor of the National Democratic Committee and took an active part in the campaign just closed. He compiled the Democratic Campaign Text-Book of 1888, and has edited the "Writings and Speeches of Grover Cleveland" and written a "Life of Grover Cleveland."

MR. SYDNEY G. FISHER (*Alien Degradation of American Character*), born in Philadelphia in 1856, was graduated at Trinity College, Hartford, in 1879. He studied law at the Harvard Law School, was admitted to the Philadelphia Bar in 1883, and has practised there ever since. He has been active in Civil Service Reform, and he is the author of a number of essays on legal and historical subjects, among them "The Independence of the Departments of Government," "The Suspension of *Habeas Corpus* During the War of the Rebellion," "The Causes of the Increase of Divorce," and "The Railroad Leases to Control the Anthracite Coal Trade."

DR. J. M. RICE (*The Public-School System of New York City*), born in Philadelphia in 1857, was graduated from the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons in 1881. He took a course in psychology and pedagogy at the universities of Jena and Leipzig, after which he visited the schools of various European countries. Dr. Rice, in the service of the FORUM, has visited the public schools in thirty-six cities, spending every school-hour in schoolrooms, making the investigations upon which he has based these articles.

MR. CHARLES S. GLEED (*The Wealth and Business Relations of the West*), born in Lamoille County, Vt., in 1856, was educated at the University of Kansas. He entered journalism, and became editor-in-chief of the Denver "Daily Tribune." He was for a few years engaged in the traffic department of the Union Pacific and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fé R. R., and was for several years assistant to General-Solicitor Peck in the law department of the latter company. He has written much on current political, economic, and educational topics.

MR. FREDERIC HARRISON (*Literary and Municipal Problems in England*), was born in London in 1831, and was educated at Kings College, London, and at Wadham College, Oxford. In 1853 he was elected fellow and tutor at Oxford. He was admitted to the Bar in 1858 and practised law from 1860 until 1874. In 1867–69 he was member of the Royal Commission of Trade Unions; in 1878–89, professor of jurisprudence for the Council of Legal Education, and in 1889 he was elected an Alderman in the London County Council. He has devoted a large portion of his life to the study of philosophy, and he is the chief exponent of the Positivist school. Among his works are "The Meaning of History," "Social Statics," "Order and Progress," and "Oliver Cromwell." He is also an occasional contributor to the leading reviews, chiefly of England.

MR. L. LÉVY-BRUHL (*French Political Stability and Economic Unrest*), born in Paris in 1857, was graduated at the "*École Normale*" in 1884. Since 1886 he has been a professor in the "*École des Sciences Politique*." Among his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

publications are the "Formation of the Unity of Germany" and the "Notion of Responsibility."

DR. F. HEINRICH GEFFCKEN (*German Socialism and Literary Sterility*), born in Hamburg, Germany, in 1830, is professor *emeritus* of international law in the University of Strasburg. He became widely known several years ago through his imprisonment and trial upon a charge of high treason by Prince Bismarck for publishing the diary of the late Emperor Frederick. He is one of the foremost European political writers.

PROF. GEORGE HERBERT PALMER (*Can Moral Conduct be Taught in Schools?*), born in Boston in 1842, was graduated in 1864 at Harvard College, where he is now professor of philosophy. Among his publications are "Positive Limitations of the Elective System," "The New Education," and one of the best English versions of the "Odyssey." He has also contributed occasionally to the magazines.

PROF. ARTHUR TWINING HADLEY (*Jay Gould and Socialism*), born in New Hampshire in 1856, was graduated at Yale in 1876. He studied at the University of Berlin, and in 1879 became tutor at Yale, in 1883 lecturer on political science, and in 1886 professor of political science. He has published "Railroad Transportation: its History and its Laws," and contributed to current publications.

ADDENDUM: Since Mr. Bacon's article was written the report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year ending October 31, 1892, has appeared, announcing that one hundred and sixty-three new banks have been organized during the year preceding that date, of which eighty-two are located west of the Mississippi River and thirty-six in the Southern States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED